THREE SERMONS UPON THE SACRAMENT

IN WHICH

Tranſubſtantiation is impartially conſiderd, as to Reaſon, Scripture, and Tradition.

To which is added a Sermon upon the Feaſt of S. George.

By N. N. Preacher in Ordinary to their Majeſties.

LONDON. M. DC. LXXXVIII.

BIBLIOTHECA·BODLEIANA

A SERMON

Preacht before the

KING

AT WHITE-HALL,

June. 24. 1688.

Quomodo fiet iſtud ?
How ſhall this be done ?
Luke. 1. 34.

THE Enemies of Chriſt's *Divinity* abhorr the Faith of it, as contrary to *Senſe*, becauſe all thoſe who ſaw him, plainly ſaw he was a Man; and oppoſite to *Reaſon*, becauſe it ſeems to them impoſſible, either for Immenſity to be comprehended in the compaſs of a man, or for one Perſon to ſub-

 ſiſt

ſiſt in two Natures. The Enemies of *Tranſubſtantiation* urge the ſame arguments againſt it. They ſay 'tis contrary to *Senſe*, becauſe all thoſe who ſee it, plainly ſee 'tis bread; and oppoſite to *Reaſon*, becauſe it ſeems to them impoſſible, either for *Chriſt's* body to be comprehended in ſo ſmall a compaſs, or for one body to be at the ſame time in two places. Never was *S. Paul's* advice more ſeaſonable than in this Age of ours. He tells us, that it is our Duty * *to caſt down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth it ſelf againſt the knowledge of God, bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Chriſt.* I muſt confeſs, 'tis naturall enough to entertain a doubtfull thought of what is far above the reach of Reaſon. When things are ſo extremely difficult, that no man can conceive the manner *how* they are perform'd, we preſently are apt to think they are impoſſible; *How ſhall this be done?* But this is a proud thought that muſt be humbled; 'tis a rebellious *imagination* which (if *S. Paul* ſays true) muſt be *caſt down*; it *exalts it ſelf againſt the knowledg*

* 2. *Cor.* 10. 5.

knowledg of God, and muſt *be brought into captivity*. *S. Iohn Damaſcen* in his *Orthodox Faith*, * propoſes an illuſtrious example of our Duty, in a parallell betwixt the *Incarnation* & *Euchariſt*; and by the *Bleſſed Virgin's* humble ſubmiſſion to that myſtery, ſhews how we ought to captivate our underſtanding in believing this. Thus he diſcourſes & compares both myſteries. *How ſhall this be done, ſaid the Bleſſed Virgin, ſeeing I know not a man? The Archangel Gabriel anſwerd; The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, & the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee. You alſo ask me the like Queſtion; How can bread be made the body of Chriſt, & wine mixt with water become the blood of Chriſt? I alſo give you the ſame anſwer; The Holy Ghoſt deſcends, & effects ſuch things as far exceed not only our expreſſions, but our underſtandings.* The myſteries of *Faith* would be no longer myſteries, if *Reaſon* comprehended them, much leſs would they deſerve that Name, if *Senſe* diſcoverd them. We commonly ſay, that *Seeing is Believing*; and amongſt Men acquainted

* 3. *b.* 14. *ch.*

with the cheats of a deceitfull world, we find the wiſeſt are the ſloweſt in believing what they do not ſee. But yet the word of God has ſo much credit with us, that we confidently truſt him farther than we ſee him: and when we hear him ſay, *This is my body*, we *believe* it though we do not *ſee* it. Nor is it any wonder, that we boldly venture to believe ſuch things as are *beyond* the reach of *Senſe*; more than it is, that we believe ſuch points as are *above* the reach of *Reaſon*. If *Tranſubſtantiation* were either *contrary* to *Senſe* or *Reaſon*; then indeed the clamours of our Adverſaries would be ſomething plauſible: But if it be neither contrary to *Senſe*, as I ſhall plainly ſhew in my firſt part; nor contrary to *Reaſon*, as I ſhall endeavour to prove in my ſecond; all their unreaſonable clamours will be little valued; and all their noiſe, which is the laſt and weakeſt refuge of a baffled Cauſe, will ſignifie juſt nothing. Permit me only, in the firſt place, to beg the aſſiſtance of my *Saviour* whoſe cauſe I plead, and to deſire his *Virgin Mother*, with all the *Angels* & *Saints* in Heaven, to joyn their prayers with mine. FIRST

FIRST PART.

We are all of us willing to believe our eyes; and truly we have reaſon to believe them, eſpecially when all mens eyes agree, and in all times & places give the ſame information to our underſtandings. Not that I think it is impoſſible for the Almighty to deceive the eyes of all men by a conſtant miracle of his Omnipotence; but that I have good reaſon to ſuppoſe he uſes methods more conformable to reaſonable nature. One great occaſion of men's thinking that their ſenſes are impoſed upon, is but a falſe perſuaſion, that when they ſee the *Sacrament*, they muſt believe the outward form, the ſurface, & the qualities, which we ſee, touch, & taſt, to be the true *Body* & *Blood* of *Chriſt*. If this were ſo, they would have reaſon to be jealous of their ſenſes being contradicted. But if theſe people would reflect, that all this outward form, the ſurface, and the qualities, which we obſerve, are really in all reſpects the very ſame as they are repreſented to our ſenſes; that they are not belie-

ved by us to be the true Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, but only the coat which cloaths it, the curtain which is drawn before it, the veil which shrouds it and hides it from our ſenſes: that when we fall down on our knees to adore our Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt*, whom we firmly believe to be really and ſubſtantially preſent by a miracle inſenſible and imperceptible to all our ſenſes, we do not adore the coat which cloaths him, nor the curtain which is drawn before him, nor the veil which shrouds & hides him from us: we only adore the God of our Salvation, who in the myſtery of the Incarnation hid his Divinity in flesh, & in the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation* hides his flesh & blood under the forms of bread & wine: *Verily*, ſays the Prophet *Iſaiah*, * *Thou art a God that hideſt thy ſelf, O God of Iſrael, the Saviour.* If people would but leiſurely reflect, that all which they perceive by any of their ſenſes is really and truly the ſame as they perceive it; that Faith dos not oblige them to believe the contrary, but only to believe that under the ſuperficies of theſe outward

* 45. v. 15.

outward forms the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* are hid miraculouſly, & conceal'd from all their ſenſes: Then they would eaſily conclude that *Tranſubſtantiation* is not contrary to ſenſe. My word alone perhaps has not ſufficient credit with you: you may hear *S. Anſelm*, in the end of the eleventh Century, after the condemnation of *Berengarius*. In the 1. ch. of his Tract *de Sacramento Altaris*, he plainly ſays, *That ſimilitude of bread which upon the Altar appears to our corporeal eyes, conſiderd in it ſelf, is not the body of our Lord.* No, no: you may believe your eyes, that all the exteriour forms of bread are truly there; 'tis only neceſſary to believe that the body of our Lord is really containd & hidden under them. And thus the *Council* of *Trent* expreſſely declares in the 1. ch. of the 13. *Seſſion*; not that the *ſenſible things* themſelves are truly the Body of *Chriſt*, but that *under them* his Body *is containd.*

'Tis written in the 1. of *Samuel*; * *Men look upon the outward appearances, but God looks upon the heart.* In like manner, our Senſes only perceive

* c. 16. v. 7.

ceive the outward appearances of their objects; but our Underſtanding, by which we are made to the image of God, is the onely Faculty which can diſcern the inward ſubſtance. The naked notion of *ſubſiſtent Being* cannot be perceiv'd by any ſenſe, becauſe it neither has dimention, motion, poſture, figure, colour, nor any of thoſe modifications which affect our ſenſes. The qualities and modes of matter intercept our ſight, no ſenſe can penetrate the ſuperficies of it, & diſcern the nakedneſs of ſubſtance through the cloaths it wears; we neither ſee it, nor feel it, more than we ſee or feel the ſubſtance of the Soul which animates our Body.

Now, I muſt needs acknowledge that, if when we receive the *Sacrament*, we ſaw it round, and yet believd it ſquare; if we ſaw it white, & yet believd it black; if we felt it rough, & yet believd it ſmooth; if we felt it dry, & yet believd it moiſt; if we taſted ſweetneſs in it, and yet believd it bitter; No man could then deny but that our *Faith* would teach things evidently contrary to what our *Senſes* tell us. But, as the caſe ſtands with

with us in this article, I never yet could ſee how any thing, but ignorance, can poſſibly excuſe all thoſe who ſlap us ore the mouth with the abſurdity of contradicting all our ſenſes. We really believe, the ſuperficies or outward form is round and white, juſt as we ſee it; if we feel it rough and dry, we take it to be ſuch; and when we taſt it ſweet, we do not queſtion but it is ſo. We firmly, without any heſitation, believe all that our Senſes repreſent unto us; we declare to all the world that we believe our Senſes; we live & dy in a perſuaſion that in this myſtery our Senſes tell us nothing but what's true; And yet ſome people have the face to tell us, that we contradict our ſenſes. A ſtrange world it is, we live in now, that makes no conſcience of ſaying any thing!

I know very well, you'l readily object, that after conſecration we ſee the *Subſtance* of bread, and we believe the *Subſtance* is not there: is not this, contradicting of our *Senſes*? I grant, that after conſecration we ſee the *ſubſtance* as plainly as we did before; but this I flatly deny, that any man ever ſaw the *ſubſtance* of bread either be-

fore or after. 'Tis true; moſt men, who do not underſtand *Philoſophy*, are apt to think that when they ſee bread lie before them, they ſee the *ſubſtance* of it: They never imagine that there is as much difference betwixt ſeeing *bread*, & ſeeing the *ſubſtance* of bread, as there is betwixt ſeeing *ſubſtance* with all its cloaths on, and ſeeing of it naked. When they ſee the length, bredth, depth, the figure, texture, colour, of the parts of bread, they think they ſee the *ſubſtance*; and 'tis no wonder, that they are miſtaken, becauſe they do not underſtand what *ſubſtance* is. But if they would go to ſchool to *Ariſtotle* or *Carteſius*, the two chief Maſters of the old & new Philoſophy, the Firſt would teach them, that when they think they ſee or feel the *ſubſtance* of any body, they only ſee & feel the *accidents*, the quantity & qualities that cover it; The ſecond would eaſily inform them, and let them know they only ſee & feel the ſuperficies & modes of matter, which may remain the ſame, to all intents & purpoſes, and make the ſame impreſſion upon our ſenſes, although the entity of matter be entirely chang'd. If any of you are

ſo

ſo curious, you may read *Carteſius* himſelf upon this ſubject, in the end of his *Meditations*, pag. 137 of the 5. edition, printed at *Amſterdam*, in the year 1670. *

Some

* Notandum denique per ſuperficiem panis aut vini alteriuſve corporis, non hic intelligi partem ullam ſubſtantiæ nec quantitatis .... ſed tantummodo terminum illum qui medius eſſe concipitur inter ſingulas ejus particulas & corpora ipſas ambientia, quique nullam planè entitatem habeat niſi modalem.

Iam verò cum in ſolo termino contactus fiat, & nihil niſi per contactum ſentiatur, manifeſtum eſt ex hoc uno quod dicantur panis & vini ſubſtantiæ in alicujus alterius rei ſubſtantiam ita mutari, ut hæc nova ſubſtantia ſub eiſdem planè terminis contineatur ſub quibus aliæ..... jam exiſterent ſi adeſſent; ſequi neceſſariò illam novam ſubſtantiam eodem planè modo ſenſus omnes noſtros afficere debere, quo panis & vinum illos afficetent ſi nulla tranſubſtantiatio facta eſſet. *loc. cit.* Præterea nihil eſt incomprehenſibile aut difficile in eo quod Deus Creator omnium poſſit unam ſubſtantiam in aliam mutare, quodque hæc poſterior ſubſtantia ſub eâdem planè ſuperficie remaneat ſub quâ prior continebatur. Nec etiam quidquam rationi magis conſentaneum dici poteſt, nec vulgo apud Philoſophos magis receptum, quàm non modo omnem ſenſum ſed omnem corporis in corpus actionem fieri per contactum, huncque contactum in ſolâ ſuperficie eſſe poſſe; Vnde ſequitur evidenter eandem ſuperficiem, quantumvis ſubſtantia quæ ſub eâ eſt

mutetur.

Some of my Auditory may perhaps be a little ſurpriſed to hear ſo much *Philoſophy* deliverd in a pulpit, whence they uſually expect the Law of God & *Chriſtian* Doctrine. If without *Philoſophy* we cannot find the way to Heaven, what will become of all thoſe *Chriſtians* who never found the way to ſchool? Pray give me leave: There are a great many *Chriſtians* (let them be as ignorant as you pleaſe, eſpecially in matters of *Philoſophy*) who never the leſs think they are wiſe enough to judge the greateſt myſteries and ſecrets of it: And when they hear the *Catholick Church* affirm, that, in the Euchariſt, the interiour *ſubſtances* of bread & wine are chang'd into the body & blood of *Chriſt*, nothing remaining (but the outward forms) of bread & wine; in ſtead of receiving humbly the *Chriſtian Doctrine* which the *Church* propoſes, they immediatly take upon them to condemn it as an errour, & cry it down as

mutetur, eodem ſemper modo agere ac pati debere. Quapropter auſim ſperare venturum tempus aliquando, quo illa opinio quæ ponit accidentia realia, ... explodetur, & mea ut certa & indubitata in ejus locum recipietur, *ibid.* pag. 139.

as a ridiculous abſurdity which contradicts our ſenſes. All this while they never conſider how little it becomes them to pretend to judge of things, they do not underſtand. Tell them that in the principles both of the old & new *Philoſophy*, we never ſee the nakedneſs of any ſubſtance whatſoever, but only the outward forms which hide it from us; and therefore, if the *Almighty* have a mind to change the *ſubſtance* only, not the *accidents*, we may watch him as narrowly as we pleaſe, & never diſcover any alteration, becauſe all that our ſenſes can perceive, remains the ſame; and as, before the ſubſtance was miraculouſly chang'd, we could not ſee it; ſo, after 'tis miraculouſly chang'd, we cannot miſs it. Talk to them of theſe notions in the plaineſt terms you can, they'l ask you what you mean, & wonder what you would be at. They neither know the nature of the *ſubſtance* nor the *accidents*; they know not whether *Tranſubſtantiation* be contrary to ſenſe or no; and yet they ſtill will tell a man, it contradicts their ſenſes. 'Tis very hard, in ſuch a caſe as this, if they who do not underſtand

derſtand *Philoſophy*, may tell us, we deny our ſenſes; and they who underſtand it, may not be allow'd to tell them fairly, they are very much miſtaken. Miſtakes in matters of religion are dangerous: And certainly ſo much *Philoſophy* as is needfull to ſet us right, cannot but be allowable when ſuch miſtakes as theſe proceed from want of underſtanding it.

I ſhall conclude this part of my diſcourſe, with ſhewing, in as eaſie terms as the matter will bear, that tis impoſſible for any of our ſenſes to give evidence againſt our faith of *Tranſubſtantiation*. If we believd that *Tranſubſtantiation* were a *ſenſible change*, a *change* of any thing that is *ſenſible* in the bread & wine; then indeed, our ſenſes being judges of ſenſible things might eaſily give evidence againſt our faith: They might depoſe, that nothing ſenſible is chang'd, but that all things ſenſible remain the ſame as formerly they were; and no man could deny but that our *Faith* would contradict our *Senſes*. But, on the contrary, if we do not believe that *Tranſubſtantiation* is a ſenſible change; if we believe no change of

any

any thing which is ſenſible; then, truly, our ſenſes, not being judges of inſenſible things, cannot give evidence againſt us; they cannot depoſe that no inſenſible thing is chang'd, becauſe inſenſible matters fall not within their cognizance; and therefore, whether they are chang'd or not, is more than they can tell. If there ſhould happen a diſpute concerning difference of colours, whether they are chang'd or not? Would you remit it to the arbitration of five blind men? Since therefore the diſpute betwixt us, is about the *inſenſible* difference of *ſubſtance*, whether it be chang'd or not. How can our *ſenſes* give their ſentiment one way or other, either for it, or againſt it?

This argument is ſo convincing, that it will not bear the leaſt appearance of a ſolid *Anſwer*; and withall ſo plain, that any man without *Philoſophy* may clearly underſtand it. To which I ſhall only add a word or two more, to put a ſtop to all the cavills which may poſſibly ariſe from the diverſity of ſchoolmen's fancies.

Tis evident that the *Catholick Church*, by the *ſubſtance* which is be-

liev'd

liev'd to be chang'd in the *Sacrament*, dos not underſtand any thing that is *ſenſible* in bread & wine. The *Council* of *Trent* in the 2. *Canon* of the 13. *Seſſion*, ſuppoſes as a certain & undoubted truth, that all *things ſenſible remain* the ſame; *manentibus ſpeciebus panis & vini*: And, in the 1. ch. of the ſame *Seſſion*, tells us, that the body & blood of *Chriſt are contain'd under* them, *ſub ſpecie illarum rerum ſenſibilium*. Tis true, the *Council* dos not offer to define what *ſubſtance* is; it dos not tell us what it underſtands by *ſubſtance*; it meddles not with definitions of *Philoſophy* but only definitions of *Faith*, determining what *Truths* were firſt deliver'd to the *Church* by *Chriſt* & his *Apoſtles*. But, though we know not in particular what 'twas the *Council* meant by *ſubſtance*, This we know for certain, that it meant not any of thoſe *ſenſible things*, but only that inſenſible *ſubſiſtent Being* which is hidden *under* them: And this is enough to ſilence all diſputes about the Evidence of Senſe. Let, who will, tell us that the *ſubſtances* of bread & wine are *ſenſible*, we always ſhall have this to

ſay,

ſay, That if by *ſubſtance* they mean ſomething which is *ſenſible*, the *Council* dos not mean the ſame; They mean one ſort of *ſubſtance*, The *Council* means another; & therefore all their arguments from evidence of ſenſe are every one miſplac'd; they are levell'd againſt a chimerical *Tranſubſtantiation* of their own invention, and not againſt that which the *Council* has defin'd. In a word, if any *Tranſubſtantiation* be contrary to ſenſe, Let them look to't; we are not at all concern'd in the matter; ſuch a *Tranſubſtantiation* is not *ours* but *theirs*. I humbly recommend this to your ſerious thoughts, & undertake to prove, that *Tranſubſtantiation* is not contrary to *Reaſon*, in the ſecond part of my *Diſcourſe*.

SECOND PART.

The *Oracles* of *Holy Scripture*, in the book of *Iob*, aſſure us, * *God is great, and we know him not.* As we do not know *him*, ſo we do not know his power; and therefore it is written in the following chapter; * *He dos great*

* 36. 26. * 37. 5.

great things which we cannot comprehend. His works are *great*; we *cannot comprehend them*: But hence it dosnot follow that they are impoſſible, becauſe He can *do great things which we cannot comprehend.* We all of us agree that myſteries of *Faith* are far above the reach of *Reaſon*, but 'tis our great misfortune, and one of the worſt effects of our original Corruption, That though we thus agree in generalls, yet in the examen of particulars we eaſily confound their being *above Reaſon* with their being *contrary*, and preſently conclude them *contrary* becauſe they are *above* it. All this proceeds from nothing but a ſecret pride or vanity, which make us willing to ſuppoſe that we are wiſer than we are; that we comprehend the ſecret *Natures* of things; underſtand clearly the *eſſentiall conſtitution* of their *Beings*; ſee evidently all the *attributes* appropriated to them, & all the qualities irreconcileably repugnant to their natures. Suppoſing this, we readily pronounce, This is impoſſible, That cannot be, This is a meer *chimera*, That's a *contradiction*; And, all this while, reflect not that we may perhaps be very much miſtaken

in

in our arbitrary notions, from whence we draw ſo eaſily theſe bold Concluſions. We do not conſider the Hiſtory, as well as Theory, of *Natural Philoſophy*; if we did, we ſhould find ſuch ſtrange varieties & alterations in it, as would demonſtrate the uncertainty of of all its principles. *Corpuſcular Philoſophy* was well enough received in ancient times under *Democritus* & *Epicurus*: Afterwards it was, in a manner, quite laid by, & *Ariſtotle's* Notions ſucceeded in the place: And now, the world begins to ſeem unſatisfied; his matter & form, his quantity & qualities begin to look a little out of countenance; and the *Corpuſcular Philoſophy* begins to come in play again. If we would ſpend one ſerious thought upon theſe Revolutions in the very fundamentalls of our *Natural Philoſophy*, we ſhould learn the beſt & the moſt beneficial knowledg in the world, which is the knowledg of our ignorance: We ſhould find that the vain humour, which inclines ſome few to dogmatize in *Natural Philoſophy*, proceeds not from their being wiſer than their neighbours, but rather from the ſtrength of their imaginations than the

power

power of their Reaſons: We ſhould ſee, that, ſince the Fall of *Adam*, even the works of nature are above our reach. * *No man*, ſays *Solomon*, *can find them out from the beginning to the end*: When any myſtery of *Faith* ſeems not to ſute ſo well, as we would have it, with the notions which we fancy moſt, We ſhould rather ſuſpect that we may be miſtaken in our principles, than cry it down as a chimerical abſurdity, below God's Majeſty, above his Art, & beyond the utmoſt ſtretch of his Omnipotence.

As the myſtery of the *Incarnation* ſeemd meer folly to the *Gentiles*, and a ſcandal to the *Jews*; ſo now the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation* ſeems impoſſible to ſome, incredible to others. It ſeems impoſſible, 1. for the *Natural Body* of *Chriſt* to be confin'd within ſo ſmall a compaſs; 2. for one Body to be at the ſame time in two places. It ſeems incredible, 1. that *Chriſt* ſhould put himſelf to the expence of ſo ſuperfluous a miracle, ſince he might eaſily haue given us the very ſame grace without it; 2. that he ſhould humble himſelf ſo low as to expoſe his ſacred body & blood

* *Eccleſ.* 3. 11.

blood to almoſt all the abuſes & indignities which bread & wine are ſubject to. Theſe are the principal conſiderations whence ſome are pleas'd to draw this inference; That *Tranſubſtantiation* is evidently *contrary* to *Reaſon.*

Tis ſtrange to ſee, when once our minds are prepoſſeſst with an averſion from any doctrine, how blind we are in our enquiries, how partial & unequal in our judgments. We eaſily believe the *Incarnation*, and although we know that God is infinitely greater than our little ſouls are able to conceive, although we know that there can be no limits in the vaſt extenſion of his boundleſs *Being*, although we know that his *Immenſity* has every where a *Center*, no where a *Circumference*, yet becauſe this is an article which we are willing to believe, we make no doubt but all Gods Greatneſs may be lodg'd within the compaſs of a man; and that this man, who lived & died amongſt us, is the great Creatour & Conſerver of the Univerſe. Why have you not the impudence to ridicule this myſtery, & ſay tis evidently contrary to *Reaſon*? Why do

do you not tell the world that it involves clear *contradiction*, infinity measur'd, incomprehensibility comprehended, Immensity containd within the compass of a man? The reason is, because you like this article well enough; your education has not arm'd you against it; your first institution to piety has been accompanied with dayly persuasions & inducements to submit your reason to it, & not to admit of every probable appearance of impossibility as a sufficient evidence against it. How comes it then, that, in an Age so sceptical in all things else, you are so positive & so dogmatical in this, That 'tis impossible for the Body of *Christ* to shrink into the compass of a little bit of bread? or, at the same time, be in several places? You can beleeve one *Nature* in three *Persons* really distinguisht, and one *Person* in two *Natures*, And yet you can't believe one *Body* in two *Places*. Is not this, *streining* at the lesser difficulty & *swallowing* the greater? & had not our *Saviour* reason to complain of the * *blind Guides* that *strein at a Gnat, & swallow a camel*?

The

* *Math.* 23. 24.

The Common *Answer* to this *Argument* is: That we are better acquainted with the *Nature* of a *Body*, than of a *Spirit*. *Bodies* are the familiar object of our *Senses*, and if we do not know the *Nature* of them, we know nothing at all: But our Notions of a *Spirit* are so imperfect, that it is an argument of wisdom, rather than weakness, to submit our judgments in things we cannot understand.

I must confess; if we consider only the superficial knowledge of *Bodies*, our *Mathematicians* measure very skillfully their three dimensions, we demonstrate many ingenious Truths, both usefull & delightfull, and have knowledge enough to make us proud: But, if we consider the inward constitution or nature of these very same bodies which we measure so skillfully, we shall soon find we have ignorance enough to humble us. Tis an easie thing to tell me the length of a *Line*, & to measure it by so many inches; But, who can tell me what this line is made of? is it a chain of indivisible points immediatly linkt together? or is it compos'd of parts which may be really divided lesse &

leſſe, for ever & ever, world without end? The firſt is an unconceivable piece of *nonſenſe*: And the ſecond is a *Labyrinth* which when our *Reaſon* enters it can never find the way out. What are we more acquainted with, or what is more familiar to us, than *Light* & *Colour*? And yet no body can tell certainly what they are: The Learned have diſputed ſome thouſands of years about it, & are not agreed upon the point. We *ſee*; and we believe our eyes; And nothing is more certain than that we do ſo: Yet nevertheleſs when we come to examine ſtrictly, by what means, & *how* this operation is perform'd; we are as much in the dark as if we were ſtark blind. We *move* from place to place; we meaſure our *motion*, as to time & ſpace; we know very well, whether one motion be longer or ſhorter, whether it be ſwifter or ſlower, than another: And yet when our *Natural Philoſophers* enquire into the nature of this *Motion*, nothing is more uncertain: The greateſt Wits have ever been at a loſſe when they pretend to explicate how *Motion* is poſſible; And *Zeno's* argument has never been clear-

ly

ly anſwerd. In the ſame manner, although nothing is more certain than that all the *Bodies*, which we ever were acquainted with, have three dimenſions, *length*, *bredth*, & *depth*; yet if we ſtrictly enquire into the eſſentiall notion of a *Body* by which it differs from a *Spirit*, we ſhall find it not ſo eaſie to determine, but that this matter is very dark, as well as others I haue mentiond. To make it as clear as I can, I ſuppoſe; 1. that there is no *ſubſtance* but what is either a *body* or a *Spirit*; 2. that no *Spirit* either has *dimenſions*, or is *capable* of having them: From whence I conclude; 1. that every *ſubſtance* which either has *dimenſions* or is *capable* of having them, is a *body* and no *ſpirit*; 2. that *actual dimenſions* are not the *eſſence* of a *body*, becauſe the *Idea* of them preſuppoſes the *capacity* of having them, & this *Capacity* is the firſt *Idea* by which a *Body* differs from a *Spirit*. The *Queſtion* is; Whether 'tis poſſible for a *Body* to be ſtript naked of all its dimenſions, & ſubſiſt without them?

Tis no wonder, there is ſuch con-

fuſion in deciding of this Caſe, becauſe our *Philoſophers* & *Mathematicians* are not *Country men*; They have each a peculiar language to themſelves; and (which is worſt of all) when they uſe the ſame words, they underſtand them in a different ſenſe. A *Mathematician* never conſiders the *Nature* of a *Body*, neither is it to his purpoſe; all his buſineſs is to meaſure it. The vulgar part of mankind never conſider what a *Body* is made of, any farther than they can either *uſe* it, or make *money* of it. So that a *Body* miraculouſly ſtript of all its dimenſions, being neither meaſurable, nor uſefull, nor marketable, is certainly (in the language of *Mathematicians*, & of the *Vulgar*) no *Body* at all. All the trade they drive with *Bodies* is by weight & meaſure; and therefore 'tis no wonder, if by the word *Body*, they conceive nothing but *Dimenſions*. Theſe people, by their own confeſſion, have only a ſuperficial knowledg of a *Body*: They declare frankly, they know nothing of it but the outſide. *Philoſophers* are the onely men that conſider the *inſide* of *Nature*: They are not content to gaze *without*;

without; but endeavour to enter the very *Sanctuary*, & diſcover what lies *hid* behind the *Veil*. And theſe men, if the reſt of the world would give them a fair hearing & not make too much noiſe, would ſoon decide the difficulty. The Queſtion is (putting the Caſe, that a *Body* were diveſted of its *natural dimenſions*) whether the *Remainder* would be ſtill a *Body*, or not?

Tis evident that, in the *Mathematical* or *Vulgar* ſenſe, it would not be ſo: Neither is that the true meaning of the *Queſtion*. We do not ask, whether the *Dimenſions* would *remain* when they are *gone*? We know very well, it impiies a moſt manifeſt *contradiction*. Our enquiry is only concerning the *Eſſence* of a *natural Body*, that is, of a *Subſtance* which is not a *Spirit*. And, without all doubt, when we ſuppoſe nothing to be taken from a *Body* but its *actual dimenſions*, That which we conceive to remain is ſtill a *natural Body*, becauſe 'tis certainly no *Spirit*: it ſtill retains a reall *capacity of having its natural dimenſions*, and this *Capacity* is abſolutely repugnant to the *nature* of a *Spirit*. Thus

you plainly ſee, that the *Suppoſition*, we talk of, dos not deſtroy the *Eſſence* of a natural *Body*; it dos not imply any *Contradiction*; And therefore dos not leave any reaſonable ground of denying the poſſibility of it. Men may fancy what they pleaſe; and will ever do ſo, without asking their neighbours leave; There's no remedy for it: But, after all, He muſt be a bold man that undertakes to demonſtrate the abſolute impoſſibility of the *Hypotheſis* I ſpeak of.

To return to my argument, I would now gladly enquire; ſince, in the *Incarnation* and *Trinity*, it is no argument of weakneſs, but of wiſdom, to ſubmit our judgments; Why is it not ſo in this? If the *Nature* of *God*, & the *divine Perſons*, are objects ſo *ſpiritual*, and ſo much out of our reach, that it dos not become us to dogmatize in matters belonging to them: Pray, tell me what acquaintance have we with a *Body* diveſted of all its natural dimenſions, & reduced to the condition of a *Spirit*? All our *Mathematical* & *Vulgar* notions, of which we are ſo confident, are (in this caſe) ſo far from giving us any light, that they

they are rather like ſo much duſt in our eyes that hinders us from ſeeing. Tis no part of our Faith, that *Chriſt* in the Sacrament has all his natural dimenſions: if it were, Then indeed theſe Notions might furniſh ſomething to ſay againſt it. One might argue, as *S. Auguſtin* dos againſt *Fauſtus*, that *Chriſt as to his corporal preſence could not, at the ſame time, be in the Sun & Moon, & on the Croſs.* But, in our preſent *Hypotheſis*, all our experimental knowledge of a *Body* is out of doors; And all our pretended demonſtrations are meer nonſenſe. Tis evident, that without local extenſion a *Body* is neither *confin'd* by being in *one* place, nor *divided* by being in *two*: And 'tis as eaſie a matter to meaſure a *line* without *length*, an *angle* without *ſpace*, or a *circle* without *diameter*, as it is to find work for *Mathematical* concluſions in a *Body* without *dimenſions*.

Some will ingenuouſly confeſs, they do not think that *Tranſubſtantiation* is impoſſible; but they are apt to think it is incredible, either that *Chriſt* ſhould work ſo great a miracle without neceſſity, or humble himſelf to

all thoſe great indignities to which the *Sacrament* is every day expoſed. * O *man*, ſays the Apoſtle, *who art thou that replyeſt againſt God* ? His *Goodneſs* is as infinite as his *Omnipotence*; and tis as great an inſolence to give laws to the one, as to give limits to the other. He ſeems to value more the reputation of his *Goodneſs* than of his *Power*; and if we trace his Providence throughout the Conduct of the Moral World, we cannot but obſerve that He has taken much more pains to ſhew his goodneſs than to ſhew his greatneſs. In the *Creation* of the Univerſe He ſhewd his Power: But what was that to the *Incarnation* of the *Son* of *God*? All the Perfections of Creatures diſappear, & ſhrink to nothing, when compar'd to the perfection of their great Creatour; And the whole Univerſe, by which God ſhews his Greatneſs, is nothing in compariſon of *Jeſus Chriſt* by whom he ſhews his Kindneſs to us. You all are ſcandaliz'd at their ingratitude, who will not give God thanks for this ineſtimable favour; will not believe that he has been ſo good, ſo mercifull,

* *Rom.* 9. 20.

merciſull, ſo kind. They ſay, that though 'twere poſſible it is not credible that God ſhould work ſo great a miracle without neceſſity; that there was none at all for him to come himſelf in perſon; that he might have ſent a holy man for our inſtruction, he might have charg'd him with our ſins, he might have pardon'd both him and us without condign ſatisfaction: Tis true, The *Scripture* ſeems to ſpeak in plain terms the *Divinity* of Chriſt; but yet may bear another ſenſe, and may admit a much more credible interpretation. If a *Socinian* ſhould urge this argument againſt you, you would ſcarce have patience to hear him. Why then do you object the ſame againſt the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*? Why do you tell us, 'tis incredible that God ſhould work ſo great a miracle without neceſſity? that the real preſence is not abſolutely neceſſary? that the *Sacrament* might have ſufficient efficacy to give grace without it? Why do you ſay, that though the *Scripture* plainly ſpeaks in favour of this myſtery, yet we are not obliged to take it in the literal ſenſe? that the figurative ſenſe

is much more eaſie to conceive, & therefore is a much more credible interpretation? O *man*, ſays *S. Paul* to the *Romans*, * *Who art thou that replyeſt againſt God?* * *How unſearchable are his judgments, and his ways paſt finding out! Who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his Counſellour!* This is the onely anſwer you can give to a *Socinian*; Apply it to your ſelves, & reſt content: Your argument is juſt the ſame, and either proves both myſteries, incredible, or neither.

When you object, that nothing can be more incredible, than that the Body & Blood, the ſacred *Humanity* of *Chriſt*, is ſhrouded under the outward forms of bread & wine, and conſequently expoſed to all indignities which they are ſubject to. Pray, give me leave to ask you, whether or no it be not more incredible, which we read in *S. Paul*, & in the Prophet *Iſaiah*; that * *God was manifeſt in flesh*; that in this flesh * *He was deſpiſed & rejected of men, and we eſteem'd him not: He bore our griefs,* &

* 9.20. * 11.33. & 34. * 1. *Tim.* c. 3. v. 16. * *Iſai. ch.* 53.

*& carried our ſorrows: He was wounded for our tranſgreſſions, & bruiſed for our iniquities: He was oppreſſt, he was afflicted: * He made himſelf of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a ſervant; & being found in fashion as man, humbled himſelf & became obedient unto death?* Is not this more incredible than all that you can ſay of the Sacrament?

Ah! my dear Jeſus! it grieves my heart to ſee, that thou haſt *made* thy *ſelf of no reputation*, by taking upon thee the form of bread; and that, by *being found in fashion as* bread, thou haſt humbled thy ſelf ſo low, as to be ſtill *deſpiſed, rejected*, & *diſeſteem'd by men*. But yet it is a comfort to me, when I think that thy moſt ſacred *Body* in the *Sacrament* is now immortal & impaſſible; thou doſt not now *bear* all *our griefs*, & *carry* all *our ſorrows*; thou art not *wounded* there *for our tranſgreſſions*, nor *bruiſed for our iniquities*; thou art not capable of being now *afflicted* & *oppreſſt*. Compute then, if you pleaſe, all the indignities the *Sacrament* is ſubject to; and by the way take notice that

* *Phil. ch.* 2. *v.* 6. 7.

it is a *Sacrament* no longer than the *Sacramental forms* are incorrupted; Remember that the natural alterations, which they undergo, can never operate upon him; Take theſe conſiderations along with you, And, if you have that candour & ſincerity which I am willing to ſuppoſe you have, you will ingenuouſly confeſſe that theſe indignities which *Chriſt* now ſeems to ſuffer in the forms of bread & wine, are nothing in comparison of thoſe which once He ſufferd in the form of man.

S. Paul writes to the *Coloſſians*; * *Beware leaſt any man deceive you, by Philoſophy & vain fallacy, according to the Tradition of men, and the elements of the world, & not according to Chriſt.* He writes to the *Corinthians*, that tis their duty to * *caſt down imaginations, and every high thing that exalts it ſelf againſt the knowledg of God, bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Chriſt.* He writes to the *Romans*, that they * *ſtand by faith*; bids them *not be high-minded, but fear*; &

* 2. *ch* 8. *v.* * 2. *Ep.* 10, *ch.* 5. *v.*
* 11. *ch.* 20. *v.*

& in the following chapter bids them have a care of being * *wiſe in their own conceits.* Theſe Admonitions of the *Apoſtle* were ſuperſcribed to the *Coloſſians*, *Corinthians*, & *Romans*; they were not written to us; but yet they were written for us, & *for our inſtruction.* Tis a great inſolence for human *Reaſon* to exalt it ſelf againſt *Omnipotence*: an inſolence much greater than the *Pride* of *Lucifer*: He only ſayd, he would *be like the Higheſt*; but we are not content with that, we will be *Higher* than the *Higheſt.* We ſummon the Higheſt God of Heaven and Earth before the high Tribunal of our *Reaſon*; we make him accountable to us for his actions; And by our arbitrary notions of precarious *Philoſophy* We make no ſcruple to pronounce, what ſentence we think fit, upon his *Wiſdom*, *Power*, and *Goodneſs.* But the day will come, when they who thus exalt themſelves ſhall certainly be humbled; and (as *S. Peter* aſſures us) They who now * *humble themſelves under the mighty hand of God*, ſhall be *exalted*

* 12. *ch.* 16, *v.* * 1. *Ep.* 5. *ch.* 6, *v.*

exalted in due time : which happyneſs may the *Almighty* grant us through the grace and merits of his onely beloved *Son* our *Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, Amen.

A SERMON

Preacht before their

MAIESTIES

AT WINDSOR.

Auguſt. 26. 1688.

Hoc eſt Corpus meum.
This is my Body.
Math. 26. 26.

AMongſt the *nine & thirty articles* of the pretended *Reformation*, the *twenty eighth* aſſerts; 1. that *Tranſubſtantiation cannot be prov'd by holy Writ*; 2. that it *is repugnant to plain words of holy Scripture*. It neither is my inclination nor deſign to throw dirt in the face of any men, but only to

to wipe it inoffensively & fairly of our own; by appealing to their own *Translation* of the Bible; and shewing, 1. that *Transubstantiation* is not any way *repugnant to plain words of holy Scripture*; 2. that nothing can be better *provd by holy Writ*. This is in short the whole extent of my design, and shall be the subject of your entertainment, as soon I have begg'd the assistance of my *Saviour*, desiring his *Virgin-Mother* with all the *Angels* & *Saints* to second my petition.

FIRST PART.

That all men do not rightly understand the word of God in *Scripture*, is a Truth which no man can deny that has a grain of common sense. Every man plainly sees how in our Nation the reformed religion is crumbled into multitudes of Sects, as opposite in many things to one another, as they are to us. They all read *Scripture*, follow *Scripture*, prove & disprove what they please by *Scripture*; and all the while, as they agree in nothing more than in the *book*, so they agree in nothing lesse than in the

the *ſenſe*. No man is bound to think his neighbour, or the whole *Church*, wiſer than himſelf; but every man has as much liberty, as he has vanity, to think himſelf the beſt interpreter of *Scripture* for himſelf. Amidſt this great confuſion, what wonder is it, if we find that many, with as little modeſty as reaſon, face us down, that *Tranſubſtantiation is repugnant to plain words of holy Scripture?*

The Text, which firſt appears againſt us, is in the 3. ch. of the *Acts*, where it is ſaid of *Chriſt*, that * *the Heavens muſt receive* him *till the time of reſtitution of all things*: whence it plainly follows, that his body is in heaven, & muſt be in heaven till the time of reſtitution, that is, till the day of judgment. All this is very true; and we believe it as much as any of our neighbours. But how comes this Text to contradict his real preſence in the *Sacrament*? The *Scripture* tells us that our Saviours Body is in heaven; but where dos it teach us that it is not at the ſame time upon earth? Where dos it plainly ſay, No miracle can make one body at the ſame time be

* v. 21.

be in ſeveral places? Shew us but this deliverd plainly in the *Scripture*, and then wee'l grant that *Tranſubſtantiation* is repugnant to it. Some, upon this occaſion, produce the *Angel's* words, who in the laſt chapter of *S. Matthew*, told the women at the ſepulchre, *He is not here, for He is riſen*: where the *Angel* ſeems to conclude, that becauſe his body was in another place, therefore it was not in that place. All the whole ſtreſs of this argument depends upon a word of ſo little moment, that the laſt of *S. Mark* quite leaves it out; & the laſt of *S. Luke* not only leaves it out, but puts another in the place: in *S. Mark*, the *Angel* ſays, *He is riſen, He is not here*; in *S. Luke* he ſays, *He is not here, but is riſen.* But however, if the *Angel's* Reaſoning in *S. Matthew* muſt be ſo much magnified; when they have made the beſt they can of it, 'twill amount to neither more nor leſs than this; *He is not here*, becauſe *he is riſen*, that is, He is not here *becauſe* he is gone from hence; which inference is not a jot the worſe, although we should ſuppoſe that the ſame body may be, at the ſame time, in a thouſand

ſand places. Let us ſuppoſe his Body at the ſame time, if you pleaſe, in millions of places; yet, if it be true, that *he is riſen* & gone from hence, it follows evidently that *he is not here.*

The ſecond Text is found in the 3. ch. of *S. Paul* to the *Coloſſians*; where he gives both them & us good counſel; bids us * *ſeek* for *things above*, things which are only to be found in heaven, *where Chriſt ſits at the right hand of God*; joys which are heavenly & everlaſting, which in the ſame chapter he calls the * *reward of our inheritance*; He bids us raiſe our hearts above the world, above the vanities the pleaſures & temptations of it: Alas! all this is nothing to our preſent purpoſe; all this we believe, although we know his body is as really on earth, as 'tis in heaven. Did not our Saviour preach the ſame to his Apoſtles? And yet he lived amongſt them upon Earth.

The third Text lies before us in the 14. of *S. Mark*, where our Redeemer makes a plain Antitheſis betwixt him & the poor, compares him.

* v. 1. 2. * v. 24.

himſelf with them, & shews the difference betwixt their caſe & his. * *You have the poor with you always*, ſays he, *and when you will you may do them good, but me you have not always*: as if he should ſay; you will always have the poor in a condition of doing them good; but, as for me, you will not always have me in that indigent condition, you will not hereafter be in a capacity of doing me any good. When he was viſible amongſt us before his reſurrection, he was ſubject to our natural neceſſities, and it was in our power to relieve & eaſe him: But in the *Sacrament* he is immortal & impaſſible, incapable of being injur'd by the malice of his enemies, or betterd by the ſervice of his friends.

This Text not being able to ſupport ſo weak a cauſe, a fourth is borrowd from the 1. *Cor.* in the 11. chapter, where the Apoſtle ſays, * *We shew the Lord's death till he comes*: therefore he is not come yet; and, if he be not come, How is he really preſent in the *Sacrament*? Let us reflect a little, & examine the ſenſe of theſe

* v. 7. * v. 26.

theſe words, *till he comes.* This coming of our Saviour is repeated frequently in *Scripture*: in the 1. ch. of the *Acts*, we read, * *He ſhall come in like manner as you have ſeen him go*, in the 14. of *S. Mark*, * *You ſhall ſee him coming in the clouds*; in the 24. of *S. Math.* * *They ſhall ſee him coming in power & great glory.* Every man that can but ſay his Creed, is well acquainted with this *coming*, which is ſo much celebrated in the Scripture; we all believe that this *his coming* is *to judge the quick & the dead.* When they read in the Bible, *we ſhew the Lords death till he comes*; they inferr, Therefore he is not come yet: Very true: The Lord's Day is not come; the Day of judgment is not come; and onely God knows when it will come: But, is it therefore evident that in the *Sacrament* there is no *Tranſubſtantiation*, no *Real Preſence*, becauſe the Day of judgment is not come? I am inclin'd to think that, when it dos come, when *Chriſt* comes to judge the world, & calls all thoſe to an account who have pretended, every one according to their fancy, to reform

* *v.* 11. * *v.* 62. * *v.* 30.

reform his *Church*, they then will wish too late that, either they had let the *Church* alone, or else had had much better evidence than this to justifie the Reformation.

The fifth Text seems to promise more, & yet performs as little as the rest: We find it in the 22. of *S. Luke*, where our *Saviour* says, * *Do this in remembrance of me.* Now, say they, we cannot remember any thing but what is absent, and therefore the Body of Christ must of necessity be absent from the *Sacrament*, cannot be really & truly present in it. Pray, cannot I remember God, & take delight in thinking of his goodness? Remember my own sinfull soul, & pity her condition? And is not my soul present in my Body? Is not the *Almighty* present every where? * *Remember thy Creatour in the days of thy youth*, says *Solomon* in the last chapter of *Ecclesiastes*; and yet this great Creatour is not absent from us: *S. Paul* says, in the 17. ch. of the *Acts*, * *He is not far from every one of us.* Though He is always present, yet we easily forget him, because he is not present

* v. 19. * v. 1. * v. 27.

preſent to our ſenſes: And I am afraid, becauſe we do not ſee the inviſible body & blood of *Chriſt*, I am afraid we now & then forget how great a treaſure we receive when we approach the *Sacrament*: I am afraid, becauſe we neither ſee nor feel our ſouls, we oftentimes neglect & almoſt quite forget the great concern of our ſalvation, differring it from time to time, till by God's judgment death ſurpriſes us, and we are loſt for all Eternity.

The two laſt Texts as they have moſt appearance ſo they have the leaſt of ſubſtance when they are examin'd. *S. Paul* ſays in his 1. *Cor.* 11. ch. * *Let a man examine himſelf, & ſo let him eat of that bread*: Our *Saviour* ſays, in the 26. ch. of *S. Math.* * *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine*: Both of them ſpeak thus after conſecration; Both of them call it *bread* & *wine*; And therefore, after conſecration, it ſtill remains true *bread* & *wine*. You ſee how fairly I propoſe the difficulty, and now I humbly beg your beſt attention to the Anſwer. *S. Paul* dos not ſay, *This is Bread*: Our *Saviour* dos not ſay, *This is Wine*: *S. Paul* dos not

* v. 28. * v. 29.

not contradict our *Saviour*; nor dos our *Saviour* contradict himself: Why then do they call it *bread* and *wine*? The Answer is obvious; Not because it was bread & wine then, but because it was bread & wine before. Nothing is more familiar in *Scripture* than this way of speaking. *S. John* in the 9. ch. of his *Ghospel*, relating the miraculous cure of the man that was born *blind*, tells us in the 7. v. *He went his way & washt & came seeing:* and yet afterwards in the 17. v. he calls him *blind*, and tells us what they *say to the blind man again.* Why dos the *Scripture* call him *blind* after his sight was restord? The reason is, not because he was blind then, but because he was blind before. Turn to the 7. ch. of *S. Luke*, and in the 22. v. you'l read these words of our *Saviour*, *The blind see, the lame walk, the deaf hear:* he says they *see*, and yet he calls them *blind*; he says they *walk*, & yet he calls them *lame*; he says they *hear*, & yet he calls them *deaf*. Why dos he call them *blind, lame*, & *deaf*, when he himself bears witness that they *see*, *walk*, & *hear*? The Answer lies before you: He calls them so, not because they were so

then

then, but becauſe they were ſo before. In the 2. ch. of *S. Iohn*, the ſubſtantial change of water into wine was much the ſame as *Tranſubſtantiation*, & therefore the example is fitter for the purpoſe. In the 9 v. you read, that *the Ruler of the Feaſt taſted the water that was made wine*: You cannot but obſerve how plainly the *Scripture* ſays, it *was made wine*, and at the ſame time plainly calls it *water*. Will any man deny this miracle, and ſay it was not really & truly wine, becauſe the *Scripture* calls it *water* after it *was made wine*? No, no; 'tis clear that, when the miracle was done, the *Scripture* calls it water, not becauſe it was water then, but becauſe it was water before. Read the 7. ch. of *Exodus*: you'l find in the 10. v. *Aaron caſt down his rod before Pharaoh, & it became a Serpent*: in the 11. v. *The Magicians of Egypt alſo did in like manner*: & in the 12. v. *They caſt down every man his rod, but Aaron's rod ſwallowed up their rods*. Pauſe here one moment. The *Scripture* plainly tells us that theſe rods were all chang'd into Serpents; and yet, after the change, the Scripture calls them rods; not

becauſe they were rods then, but becauſe they were rods before. If any of our Adverſaries have a mind to ſay, theſe rods were not chang'd into Serpents, that *Chriſt* never chang'd water into wine, that when he told *S. John's* diſciples *the blind ſee, the lame walk, the deaf hear*, he ſent them back to their maſter with ſo many lies in their mouths; if they have a mind to ſay, our *Saviour* never cur'd the man *born blind*; then they may have the ſame pretence to magnifie this trifling argument: But if they are the men which I would willingly believe they are, if they are candid & ſincere, if they ſubmit their judgment fairly to the word of God, as it is plainly written in their own tranſlation of of the Bible; they cannot but ingenuouſly confeſs that *Tranſubſtantiation* is not any way *repugnant to plain words of holy Scripture*; but that *Scripture* it ſelf confutes the beſt of all their arguments which they produce againſt it.

I will not ſay tis ignorance, but I am ſure 'tis either that, or want of ingenuity, which makes men argue that, becauſe there are ſome metaphors

in

in Scripture, Therefore the words of Conſecration are a Metaphor or Figure. No man denies but that we often meet with metaphors in *Scripture*; but then, either the common phraſe of ſpeaking evidently marks them out, or elſe they are explaind by what fore-runs or follows the expreſſion, & ſo explaind that no judicious Reader doubts the meaning of them.

When, in the 6. of *S. Iohn*, our Saviour ſays, *I am the bread of life*; He adds, *he that comes to me ſhall never hunger*: When, in the 8. He ſays, *I am the light of the world*; He adds, *he that follows me, ſhall have the light of life*: When, in the 10. He ſays, *I am the door*; He adds, *by me if any man enter, he ſhall be ſaved*: When, in the 14. He ſays, *I am the way*; He adds, *no man comes to my Father, but by me*: When, in the 15. He ſays, *I am the Vine*; He adds, *he that abides in me, brings forth much fruit.*

So when *S. Paul* tells the *Epheſians*, 5. ch. 30. v. We *are members of his body, of his flesh & of his bones*; He explicated it in the 23. v. that this *Body*, which *Chriſt* is the *Head* and *Saviour* of, is the *Church*; And when

he mentions *flesh & bones*, he only carries on the metaphor by a myſterious alluſion to the 2. of *Geneſis*, becauſe as *Eve's* Body drew its Being from the ſide of the *firſt Adam* when he ſlept in Paradiſe, ſo alſo the *Church* derives the grace, which animates it, from the ſide *the flesh & bones* of the *laſt Adam* when he ſlept his mortal ſleep upon the Croſs. The verſe, which follows, leads directly to the place, and gives us, word for word, the 24. v. of the 2. of *Geneſis*, that we may evidently know the Senſe and Ground of the Compariſon.

In the ſame manner, no leſs care is taken in the 1. to the *Cor.* 10. ch. & 4. v. to explicate theſe words, *That Rock was Chriſt. S. Paul* ſeems to write with as much caution as if he had forſeen how much theſe words would be abuſed by thoſe who now compare them with the words of Conſecration. Leſt any man might think that, when he ſaid *that rock was Chriſt*, he took the word *rock* in the literal ſenſe, he plainly ſays, he ſpeaks of *ſpiritual meat* & *ſpiritual drink*; he ſays in the ſame verſe, *they drank of that ſpiritual rock which*

followd

followd them, and that rock, (that is, *that ſpiritual rock*) *was Chriſt*. What could a man ſay more to acquaint the world with the true meaning of his words, & give us an aſſurance that it is not literal, but only figurative & metaphorical?

Some people are willing to believe that, becauſe *Chriſt's* body & blood are only metaphorically *broken* & *ſhed* for us in the *Sacrament*, therefore they are not really his body & blood: As if, becauſe one word is figurative in a ſentence, therefore all the reſt muſt be ſo too, meerly for keeping it company; or as if we were oblig'd to believe that, becauſe *Chriſt's ſitting at the right hand of his Father* is a meer metaphor, therefore he did not really *aſcend to Heaven*. When in *S. Luke*, & in the 1 *Cor.* we read theſe words, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood*; the *Cup* is one metaphor, the *Teſtament* is another, but hence it dos not follow that the *blood* of *Chriſt* is meerly metaphorical: For, in the common way of ſpeaking, when we ſay, *This Glaſs is a new Health in Wine*, the *glaſs* is one metaphor, the *health* is another, and yet the *wine* is truly

& ſubſtantially Wine. Having thus expoſed the weakneſs of their arguments, by which they undertake to shew that *Tranſubſtantiation is repugnant to plain words of holy Scripture*; I shall now endeavour to make out, that *Tranſubſtantiation* may (if any thing can) be plainly *provd by holy Writ*: the proof of which shall make the ſecond part of my Diſcourſe.

SECOND PART.

In the 6. ch. of *S. Iohn*, our *Saviour* promiſes that he will give us his flesh, that ſacred flesh which he deſign'd to ſacrifice upon the Croſs for our Redemption. In the 51. v. he ſays, *the Bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.* I know very well that in the former verſes, from 26. to 51. He uſes ſome expreſſions which are purely metaphorical: But, whatſoever a few modern Authors may ſay of this matter, I can never be perſuaded, that this chapter talks of nothing elſe but *Faith*; & that from 50. to 60. the *Eating*, which is ſo much talkt of, ſignifies nothing but *Believing*. We have

have appeal'd to *Scripture*: Let it judge the Caſe betwixt us.

When in the 52 v. we read how *the Jews ſtrove amongſt themſelves, ſaying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* we know they underſtood him in the literal Senſe, & wonderd how it could be true. If he had ſpoken *only* in a figurative Senſe; it had been eaſy to have told them ſo. In other matters, of much leſs importance, 'twas his uſual cuſtom to expound his meaning. *Iohn*, the 3. ch. & 4. v. *Nicodemus* ſaid to him, *How can a man be born again when he is old?* He let him underſtand He did not mean it in the literal ſenſe, but that He ſpoke of Baptiſm: *Except a man be born of water & the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* Matth. 13. He propoſed to his Diſciples the *Parable* of the *Sower*: They underſtood it not: He preſently expounded it to them. The *Parable* of *Tares* they underſtood as little; but, as ſoon as they deſir'd him, He declar'd to them the whole myſtery of it. In theſe & other occaſions, when he had ſpoken any thing obſcurely, He was always willing to interpret it: And

there was never more neceſſity than when the *Jews* were ſcandaliz'd to hear him ſay, *the Bread that I will give is my Flesh.* If he only deſign'd to give them *Bread* & not his *Flesh*, I will not ſay He ought to have explain'd himſelf, becauſe to punish their perverſneſs He might lawfully have left them in their ignorance; and, though he were the *Light of the world*, yet He might juſtly leave thoſe in the dark who obſtinately shut their eyes againſt him. But, that our *Saviour* should not only refuſe to explicate his words, but alſo make it his buſineſs to confirm them in an errour; that He, who came to inſtruct the world, should labour to deceive it; that He, who left the *ninety nine sheep* in the *Deſert*, should endeavour to drive the *loſt sheep* farther from the true way home; Let, who will, ſay it, A *Chriſtian* muſt be asham'd to think it. If he were then reſolv'd to give us nothing elſe to eat & drink but *bread* & *wine*, is it probable that He would ſo induſtriouſly repeat the eating of his *Flesh* & drinking of his *Blood*? Is it poſſible that he should tell them in the 55. v. *My Flesh is meat indeed*,

& my Blood is drink indeed, if really the meat & drink were neither *Flesh* nor *Blood* ? When, in the 24. of *S. Luke*, our Adverſaries read, *our Lord is riſen indeed*; or, in the 4. of *S. Iohn*, *this is indeed the Saviour of the world*, They underſtand it & believe it in the literal ſenſe : But, when they read theſe words, *my Flesh is meat indeed*, *& my Blood is drink indeed*, they believe 'tis nothing elſe but ſacred *bread* & *wine*. Is this *Believing* Scripture ? No, no; When *Scripture* ſpeaks as plainly in one place as in another, & no convincing reaſon can be given why they force the ſenſe of this place more than that, if they believe that & not this, They do not believe the *Scripture* but themſelves; They do not believe becauſe they *read* it, but becauſe they *like* it.

When the *Diſciples* ſaw how ſeriouſly their *Maſter* taught the literal ſenſe, they cryd out, in the 60. v *this is a hard ſaying*, *who can hear it* ? They conſider'd it *foolishly* (ſays *S. Auſtin*) * *they underſtood it carnally*, *& thought our Lord would chop of morſels of his flesh*, *& give it them*:

* In Pſal. 98.

They were not only ſtartled at the ſeeming impoſſibility, but alſo at the barbarouſneſs of the deſign: And the three following verſes ſhew us how our Saviour endeavour'd to let them know, it neither was impoſſible, nor barbarous. *Dos this offend you?* ſays He; Do you think I am not able to make good my words? Surely you know not who I am, you would not otherwiſe miſtruſt my Almighty Power. *But what if you ſhall ſee the Son of man aſcend up where he was before?* Then I ſuppoſe you'l know that I am God, and from that miracle conclude that this is eaſy to me, & that I have not only wiſdom to contrive but power to execute my promiſe. *Dos this offend you? It is the Spirit that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: The words that I ſpeak unto you they are Spirit & they are Life.* I do not intend to give dead morſels of my flesh, which being ſeparated from my Spirit & Divinity will profit nothing, becauſe they will not give your ſouls the life of grace. You ſhall not eat it in the natural form of human flesh; that is indeed a carnal and a barbarous way of eating it: But never-

neverthelefs, under the form of bread, you shall receive the true & real *ſubſtance* of my flesh; and this is that *ſpiritual* way of eating which you are not yet acquainted with. This is the myſtery which I expect you should believe: This neither is impoſſible nor barbarous: This is not contrary to Reaſon, though it be above it. *But* yet, ſays he, v. 64. *there are ſome of you that believe not*: And, v. 65. he tells the reaſon why; becauſe, ſays he, *no man can come unto me, unleſs it be given to him of my Father.* Proud, Silly, Wretches, as we are! We think it is ſufficient to read Gods word; we think there goes no more than reading to believe it; we never reflect that no man can believe the word of God the *Son*, unleſs he firſt receive the powerfull grace of Chriſtian Humility from God the *Father*; that Grace by which we willingly ſubmit our Reaſon to ſuch myſteries as are above it.

The 66. v. laies before our eyes the ſad example of thoſe *many diſciples* who *from that time went back & walkt no more with him.* They heard the ſame words which our Adverſaries read; They heard the 63. v. which is

ſo much magnified ; They heard with great attention & curioſity ; & if from thoſe expreſſions they had ſo clearly underſtood , that by his *flesh* he only meant a holy *ſign* or *figure* of it , they never would have damnd themſelves eternally by *walking no more with him.* They watchfully obſerv'd his countenance ; his way of ſpeaking ; and , as we better underſtand a friend when we diſcourſe with him than when we only read his Letters , ſo theſe diſciples having the advantage of our Saviours preſence & familiar converſation could not but underſtand him much better than thoſe who only read in Scripture a ſmall part of thoſe diſcourſes with which He entertaind them. They plainly underſtood that, though he ſmooth'd the difficulty by telling them He did not ſpeak of carnal eating , yet nevertheleſs He ſtill ſpoke poſitively , as to the literal Senſe : They had not that great grace of *Chriſtian Humility* , without which none can univerſally ſubmit their *Reaſon* to *Divine Authority* : They could not come to God the *Son* , becauſe they were not drawn by God the *Father* : Proud , as they were , away they went & *walkt no more*

more with Jesus Christ, because this mystery was something above their small capacity; their weak imaginations could not reach it.

See here an ancient Model of the modern Reformation! They heard the *Church* teach as our *Saviour* taught, that the *Sacramental* Bread *is Flesh indeed*, & the *Sacramental* Wine *is Blood indeed*, And so away they went with these words in their mouths, *This is a hard saying; who can hear it?* away they went, & *walkt with* her *no more.*

Our *Saviour*, who saw them thus abandon Him, and much more feelingly resented their eternal losse, than the contempt of his *Veracity*, did not so much as offer to call them back again, as certainly He would have done, had they been only guilty of mistaking what he meant; but turn'd immediatly to his *Apostles*, and in the 67. v. said to them, *Will you also go away?* Whereupon *Simon Peter answerd him; Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe & are sure that Thou art Christ the Son of the living God*: We believe, and are sure that Thou-

art

art able to make good thy words, although ſome people think them hard, & cannot hear them.

What our *Saviour* promis'd in the 6. of *S. Iohn*, He performd at his laſt ſupper: And tis no wonder that he talkt of it ſo much before hand, becauſe he dearly lov'd thoſe whom he died for, and always had his eye upon the *Legacy* which he deſign'd to leave them. The night before his death, in his laſt *Will* & *Teſtament*, He left us this holy *Sacrament* as a perpetual monument of his Affection. We wrangle & diſpute about it, what *This is?* whether it *is* truly *Bread*, or truly the *Body* of *Chriſt*? We agree that *Holy Writ* ſhall be the *Iudge*. We find, in Holy Writ, four Copies of our *Saviour's Will* & *Teſtament*; in the 26. of *S. Matthew*, the 14. of *S. Mark*, the 22. of *S. Luke*, & the 11. of the 1. to the *Corinthians*. We open all of them; reſolving to ſtand or fall by their determination. In all the Copies of his *Teſtament*, the words are plain, *This is my Body*: And, as ſoon as the words are read, They preſently tell us; tis true, Our *Saviour* plainly ſays, *This is my Body*; but yet He only

means,

means, *it is* a *ſacred* piece of *bread*, a *holy figure* of his body. For my part, I have ever admir'd, but never can ſufficiently admire, in this occaſion, the confidence of ſome men, that make ſuch noiſe with *Scripture*; and yet, as ſoon as ever the book is open, tell us the *Scripture* ſays one thing, & means another, quite contrary to what it ſays.

If it be ſaid, that nothing is more uſual than to give *Signs* the *names* of what they ſignifie: I eaſily confeſs, tis very true; when things are certainly known to be *Signs*: becauſe, *Signs* being only *Subſtitutes*, our thoughts never ſtop at them, but are preſently fixt upon the things they ſignifie; and, by the ſame reaſon that they put another *thing* in our *minds*, 'tis no wonder if they put another *name* in our *mouths*. Thus *Joſeph* plainly anſwerd *Pharaoh's* queſtion, when he ſaid, * *The ſeven Kine are ſeven years.* But when God inſtituted *Circumciſion* in the 17. of *Geneſis*, He did not ſay, in the 10. verſe, This *Circumciſion* is my *Covenant*; but, in the 11. it *ſhall be a token of my Covenant.* So, in the

12.

* *Geneſ.* 49, 26.

12. of *Exodus*, when he inſtituted firſt the eating of the *Paſchal Lamb*, from the 5. v. to the 10. it plainly appears there was ſomething in it more than ordinary, and that it was not inſignificant; ſo that it is no wonder we find it written in the 11. v. *It is the Paſſeover of the Lord*: Moreover, the following verſes explicate the figurative ſenſe; the 26. v. puts the queſtion, *what mean you by this ſervice?* What dos it ſignifie? and the 27. gives the anſwer, *it is the Sacrifice of the Lords Paſſeover*, that is, it ſignifies the *Paſſeover*. But, in our preſent caſe, 1. the *Scripture* dos not inſinuate before hand, that *bread* was an *empty Sign* of *Chriſt's body*; 2. there is nothing in *Scripture* that gives evidence for ſuch interpretation of our *Saviour's* words, as I have ſhewd in the firſt part of my Diſcourſe.

If any one object, that *Bread* and *Fleſh* are oppoſite, & therefore the ſenſe muſt of neceſſity be *figurative*: For a full anſwer to this difficulty I referr you to the 7. of *S. Luke*, where in the 22. v our *Saviour* ſays, *the blind ſee, the lame walk, the deaf hear, the dead are rais'd.* To be *blind* and

and ſee, to be *lame* and *walk*, to be *deaf* and *hear*, to be *dead* and *alive*, are things quite diſparate and oppoſite, & yet our *Saviour's* words were evidently true in the plain *literal* ſenſe. From whence we may alſo inferr, that as theſe words *the dead are rais'd* cannot be literally true, unleſs the carkaſſe be *ſubſtantially* chang'd into a living man; ſo when our *Saviour* ſays *This is my Body*, theſe words can never be true in the plain *literal* ſenſe, unleſſe the *Bread* be by a miracle *ſubſtantially* chang'd into his *Flesh*.

To prove the *literal* ſenſe, & to convince us of it, what can we wish for more than the unanimous conſent of all the four *Evangeliſts*, and the ſubſcription of *S. Paul*? There is not one of them that writes, This is only a *Sign* of my body, a meer *Figure* of my flesh. Tis impoſſible the Senſe ſhould every where be figurative in ſo many ſeveral places & yet be no where explicated in the figurative ſenſe. In other things, of leſſe concern, we find that, what is metaphorically writ by one is explicated by another. *S. Luke* in his 11. ch. writes, *if I in the*

the finger of God caſt out Devils : S. Matthew in the 12. ch. explains it, *if I caſt out Devils by the Spirit of God. S. Iohn*, 6. ch. writes, *Jeſus the Son of Joſeph*, *S. Luke* 3. ch. explains it, *Jeſus being, as was ſuppoſed, the Son of Joſeph.* Our *Saviour* frequently invites the *thirſty* to him, & promiſes them *living water* : *S. Iohn* in the 7. ch. explains it, *He ſpoke this of the ſpirit which they, who believd on him, ſhould receive.* But theſe words, which we read in all of them, are not explain'd by any one of them. From whence 'tis eaſy to inferr, that all theſe ſacred Pen-men never underſtood our Adverſaries figurative ſenſe: They literally *underſtood* it, as we do; *believd* it as they underſtood it; & *writ* as they believ'd it.

S. Mark 4. ch. 34. v. ſays of our *Saviour*, that *when they were alone He expounded all things to his Diſciples.* If then our *Saviour* us'd a *Figure*, when he ſaid, *This is my Body*, 'tis certain that *when they were alone* (at leaſt) *he expounded* this figure to them. Perhaps the four *Evangeliſts* & the *Apoſtle* knew well enough this expoſition, but forgot to write it. This will

will not serve the turn. Our *Saviour* promis'd them their memory should ever be assisted by his holy *Spirit*: In the 14. ch. of *S. John*; * *the Holy Ghost*, says he, *shall bring all things into your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you*. Perhaps they every one thought of it when they writ, but did not think it worth the writing. But if our Adversaries well consider the *sixth Article* of *Reformation*, which tells us *all things necessary to Salvation are contain'd in Scripture*, they will scarce find room for this reply: because this exposition would have been so necessary to prevent the *Idolatry* which they accuse us of, & consequently necessary to *Salvation*. Since therefore this Interpretation never could have been *forgot*, if ever they had known it; Since it could not be *omitted* if they had remember'd it; it follows clearly that this explication was never known amongst them, but only is a new invention of the modern *Reformation*, directly contradictory to *Scripture*.

I cannot but admire when I reflect, how thick a mist mens passions and prejudices

* v. 26.

prejudices raiſe before their eyes. And this is undoubtedly the reaſon why ſo many able men of the reforming *Party* ſtudy *Tranſubſtantiation* in *Scripture*, ſearch with diligence, & great appearance of ſincerity, yet never find it. If they were equal & impartial judges of the Texts which lie before them, they ſoon would ſee how grievouſly they are miſtaken in the true intent & meaning of them. By the example of this inſtance they would judge the reſt; acknowledge the injuſtice of the *Reformation*; return home joyfully to their old *Mother-Church*, & full of admiration of God's mercy to them * *ſhew forth the praiſes of Him who call'd them out of darkneſs into his wonderfull light*, which guides us through this vale of miſery to the everlaſting joys of *Heaven*. Amen.

* 1. *Pet.* 2. 9.

A SERMON

Preacht before the

KING

AT WORCESTER.

August. 24. 1687.

Interroga Majores tuos
& dicent tibi.
Ask thy Elders, & They will tell thee.
Deut. 32. 7.

IT Is now no less than six & thirty years, Most Sacred MAJESTY, since our City of *Worcester* has been honour'd with the Presence of our King. Our Loyalty was then sufficiently try'd; and now it is abundantly rewarded.

warded. Our *Loyalty*, which then was ſo well known to all the world, invited your *Royal Brother* to this *Refuge*: And we employ'd our beſt endeavours to *preſerve* his ſacred *Perſon*: But 'twas too great an *Honour* for us: The *Almighty* took it wholly to himſelf; and, by a ſurpriſing miracle of *Providence*, afterwards granted to our earneſt *Prayers* what He before denied to our unfortunate *Arms*. As we have never forfeited the credit of our *Loyalty*, we hope your MAJESTY is well aſſured we ſhall be always ready to expoſe our lives & fortunes in your MAJESTY's ſervice. It is not in the power of *Subjects* to give their *Prince* a more convincing aſſurance that they always *will be* Loyal, than that they always *have been* ſo. I only wish, with all my heart, that we had ever been as *Loyal* to the *Church* as to the *State*; and that we had as zealouſly oppoſed the *Reformation* of our *Faith*, as we withſtood the *Alteration* of our *Government*.

When I firſt appear'd in this Place, I made it my buſineſs to prove, that according to principles of *Natural Philoſophy*,

Philoſophy, the Myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation* is neither contrary to *Senſe* nor *Reaſon*. In my ſecond Sermon I endeavour'd to ſhew, it is ſo far from being contrary to *Holy Writ*, that no judicious Reader, who is free from prejudice, can underſtand *Scripture* without it. And, this being my third appearance where it is expected I ſhould finish what I have begun, I now undertake to prove it is ſo far from being contrary to the purer faith of the firſt Ages, that for the firſt eight *Centuries* the *Fathers* univerſally believ'd it. *Remember the days of old*, ſays *Moſes*, *Conſider the years of many generations*; *Ask thy Fathers & they will ſhew thee, thy Elders & they will tell thee*. My time is ſhort, conſidering the work I have before me: But yet I hope it will not be accounted loſſe of time, to ſpend one moment on my knees, in begging the aſſiſtance of my *Saviour*, and deſiring his *Virgin-Mother* with all the *Bleſſed Spirits* to accompany my prayers upon *Earth* with theirs in *Heaven*.

FIRST

FIRST PART.

* Before I enter upon our proofs of *Transubstantiation* it will be worth observing, how almost all our Adversaries are mistaken, upon a groundless supposition, that if they can find expressions in the *Fathers* which import that the *Sacrament* is a *type* a *sign* a *figure*, They need not seek any farther; The question is already decided; The *Fathers* never believ'd the mystery of *Transubstantiation*. Now, I must needs confess, if we denied the *Sacrament* to be a *type* a *sign* or *figure*, we ought to stand corrected: Or, if all this were inconsistent with the mystery of *Transubstantiation*, we ought to own our *Fathers* Belief was contrary to ours. But if in both these points our Adversaries are mistaken, we must beg their pardon if we still persever in our ancient *Faith*.

* If they would only consider the difference betwixt the *inward substance* & the *outward form*, betwixt the inside & the outside, of the *Sacrament*; They would easily reconcile the different expressions which they meet with in

in the *Fathers* writings. When the *Fathers* were intent upon the *outward form*, They call it a *type*, a *sign*, a *figure*; They say *it is not* his *Body* & *Blood*, but that it *signifies* it, *represents* it, & *contains* it.

* *S. Austin* in his 23. epistle to *Bonifacius*, says, *the Sacraments of the Body of Christ is in some manner Christ's Body, . . . as the Sacraments of Faith is Faith.* The parity is good betwixt the *outward form* of bread, and *Baptism*, in this respect, that *both* are *signs*: Only this difference there is, the first contains what it signifies, the other dos not. So in his book against *Adimantus*, 12. ch. he says, *Our Lord did not doubt to say, This is my Body, when He gave them a sign of his Body.* And why should he doubt? If a man give his friend a purse of money, He dos not doubt to say, *This is my Money*, although the Purse be only a *sign* of it. If a purse be empty, tis an empty *sign*: But if it be full, it then contains all that it signifies, and what it represents is truly & substantially present. *Bread* in the Old Law was an empty sign of *Christ's* Body: The outward form of

Bread is ſtill a ſign of it; but not an empty ſign, becauſe it really contains the ſelfſame Body which it repreſents. I take no notice of *S. Auſtin's* words in the 3. book of his *Chriſtian Doctrine*, where he ſaies, Our Saviour * *ſeems to command a heinous wickedneſs,... therefore 'tis a figure*: I take no notice of it, becauſe He dos not ſay it is an *empty* figure: He only ſays, our Saviours ſpeech is *figurative* in oppoſition to the *literal* ſenſe of the *Capernaites*, that barbarous ſenſe in which, indeed, it is a *heinous* crime to eat our *Saviour's* flesh.

* I alſo paſs over *Tertullian's* words, in his 4. book againſt *Marcion*; * *This is my Body, that is, This figure of my Body*: I paſs them over becauſe the true ſenſe amounts to no more, than that *This* bread, which in the Old Law was but a *figure of my Body*, now in the New Law *is my Body*. The obſcurity of this great man is well enough known to all that are acquainted with him: Nor can any, who converſe with him, be ignorant that the figure *Hyperbaton* is often in his mouth. In the ſame book, ch. 11. he

* *ch.* 16. * *ch.* 40.

he ſays, *To a Parable will I open my mouth, that is, Similitude*: and (in his book againſt *Praxeas*) *Chriſt is dead, that is, Anointed*. This is enough to ſhew the affected tranſpoſition of his words: And, for the ſenſe, it may be eaſily conjectur'd by the deſign of his book; the principal end of which, is to ſhew the correſpondency betwixt the *Old* Law and the *New*; to which purpoſe it was a very pertinent obſervation, that the Form of Bread, in the *Old* Law was an *empty* figure of what is *fullfill'd* in the *New*. In the ſame ſenſe *Tertullian* ſays in his 1. book againſt *Marcion*, that * *Chriſt by Bread repreſents his Body*: that is, by the outward form of Bread He exhibits it ſubſtantially preſent. So, in his 4. book, he ſays, that * *God* the Father *repreſented Chriſt* on Mount Thabor *ſaying, This is my Son*. So likewiſe in his book, *of Prayer*, he ſays, * *We pray for the repreſentation* (that is, the real preſence) *of God's Kingdom*. And, again, ſpeaking of the Day of judgment, in his book concerning the *Reſurrection*, he ſays; * *it cannot be without the repreſentation* (that is, the

D 2 perſonal

* *ch.* 14. * *ch.* 22. * *ch.* 5. * *ch.* 44.

perſonal preſence) *of all Mankind* : They who delight in reading *Tertullian* may find a great deal more to this effect; But this is enough to ſatisfie any rational man that my interpretation is not forc'd.

* *Facundus* of *Hermian* ſpeaks in the ſame Dialect, when in his [illegible] for the defence of the *Tria Capitula*, He ſays; *the Sacrament... is call'd his Body & Blood; not that the Bread is properly his Body and the Cup his Blood, but becauſe they contain the myſteries of his Body & Blood.* He explicates there, how *ſigns* are call'd by the *names* of what they ſignifie : And argues, that the *Sacrament* of Adoption may be call'd *Adoption*, as the *outward forms* of bread & wine are call'd the body & blood of Chriſt. The Argument is good : becauſe theſe *outward forms* of bread & wine, conſider'd in themſelves, are only *ſigns*; they are not properly the body of our Lord; they are only call'd ſo, becauſe they are types and figures of it; But, that they are not *empty ſigns* the ſame Author tells us, when he ſays in the ſame place, that they are call'd ſo becauſe *they contain the myſteries of his body & blood.* * If

* If ſome of you, perhaps, ſtill think it ſtrange that ſuch expreſſions as theſe ſhould be made uſe of frequently, by men who really believ'd this myſtery; For your farther ſatisfaction you may pleaſe to reflect, that not only the *Fathers* of the firſt ſix Centuries, but alſo our moſt eminent Authors who have written ſince the Condemnation of *Berengarius*, & who undoubtedly held *Tranſubſtantiation*, nevertheleſs uſe the very ſame phraſe of ſpeaking. It would be tedious to run over many inſtances: One, out of *S. Anſelm*, will be enough to ſatisfie your curioſity. About the end of the eleventh Century when, by our Engliſh *Reformers* confeſſion, the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* was fully ſettled & eſtablisht, He writes thus, in his Treatiſe *De Sacramento Altaris*, *That ſimilitude of bread, which upon the Altar appears to our corporeal eyes, conſider'd in it ſelf, is not the Body of our Lord.*

* Some people have ſuch little ſouls, they cannot raiſe their thoughts above their vulgar notions; they are not much acquainted with thoſe *ſigns* which ſignifie things preſent; thoſe

ſigns which are not appointed to ſupply the defect of *real preſence*, but only to ſupply the want of *viſible appearance*: And therefore they will not allow that there are any ſuch *ſigns* in the World. Say what you will, they mind not what you ſay, but tell you over & over again, that, if the outward *form* of the *Sacrament* be a *ſign* of his Body, 'tis certain his Body is not really and truly preſent. Have but a little patience; and I ſhall quickly clear this point. My *Speech* and *Motion* are *ſigns* of *Life* & *Soul* in me: And muſt I believe a Sophiſter, if any were ſo ſilly as to tell me, *Therefore* I am a *dead* man, becauſe it is the nature of all *ſigns* to *exclude* the *real preſence* of what they ſignifie? The form of a Serpent in *Paradiſe* was in ſome manner a *ſign* of the Evil Spirit that tempted *Eve*; and was not this *Evil Spirit* really & truly preſent? The form of a Dove appearing at our *Saviour's* Baptiſm; & the forms of fiery tongues appearing on the day of *Pentecoſt*, repreſented the *Holy Ghoſt*; And will you ſay the *Holy Ghoſt* was never really preſent, neither one time nor other? The human forms which, in

in the old *Teſtament*, the Angels uſually aſſumed, repreſented the *Angels*; And were thoſe *Angels* never truly & ſubſtantially preſent? Such inſtances as theſe, I may preſume, our Adverſaries do not well conſider: if they did, they never would conclude that the *Fathers* denied the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe they call the *outward form* a *type*, a *ſign*, or *figure*.

* Beſides this mighty difficulty, which I now have clearly ſatisfied, There remains one more; which is, that according to the Doctrine of the Fathers, the *Subſtance* of bread remains after Conſecration. Here, I muſt needs confeſs, they charge us home: And, if they can perform what they promiſe, we are always ready to come over to them. But having been, ſo long, in full & peaceable poſſeſſion of a Truth deliver'd to us as an ancient article of Faith, they cannot reaſonably expect that we ſhould quit our hold, before they bring clear evidence againſt our Title to it. Neceſſity obliges them to make this bold attempt. They know, if once they grant that all the Torrent of Antiquity runs clear and ſtrong againſt them, they never can be able

to bear up againſt the ſtream. They are ſenſible how plainly the *Fathers* ſpeak their mind in favour of this myſtery; And therefore ſearch amongſt the darkeſt paſſages of all their Writings, where they are glad to meet with any thing that makes a plauſible appearance.

* The Sum of their Objection is this; that *S. Chryſoſtom*, *Theodoret*, and *Gelaſius* expreſsly affirm, that the *ſubſtance* of bread *remains* after Conſecration; and therefore it is not chang'd into the body of *Chriſt*.

* This, at firſt ſight, ſeems plauſible enough, nor is it any wonder if it ſtartle thoſe who never heard of it before. And yet, if all theſe great Men, by their *ſubſtance*, meant no more than the true nature of the outward forms & ſenſible qualities; there is no danger of their disbelieving *Tranſubſtantiation*. We believe the *ſubſtance* is really chang'd; and theſe *Fathers* were pleas'd to ſay, the *ſubſtance* is really the ſame: but yet, after all the noiſe they make with it, the *Fathers* and we may agree ſo far as to be both in the right, if we take the ſame word in different ſenſes; & they by

by *ſubſtance* mean one thing, whilſt we mean another. *Philoſophy*, both old & new, diſtinguiſhes betwixt the *inward ſubſtance* & the *outward forms* of all corporeal Beings. Theſe are the uſual and familiar object of our *Senſes*; that's an entity ſo ſubtil & ſo metaphyſical that nothing but our *Underſtanding* can diſcern it. Tis not, indeed, a *Spirit*; but it is no more to be diſcover'd by our Senſes, than a human *Soul* is in a *Body*. Extenſion, figure, colour, and its other qualities, are the Apparel which it wears; and theſe affect our *Senſes*; But the naked *Subſtance* of all Bodies is perpetually hidden from *them*. However, although *Philoſophers* make this diſtinction betwixt the inward ſubſtance & the outward forms, nevertheleſs the Generality of Mankind look no farther than their Senſes lead them: They judge of bodies by their qualities & natural effects: By theſe they *ſenſibly* diſcern one *Subſtance* from another: And this is all they think of, when they talk of *Subſtance*. When any of the *Fathers* ſay, the *Subſtance* or *nature* of bread & wine remains after conſecration, they onely condeſcend ſo far as to ac-

comodate their way of speaking to the vulgar phrase: And truly, what they mean, we all believe: We doubt not but all, which is vulgarly understood by *substance*, is the same: We doubt not but our Senses tell us truth; and that all the outward forms & qualities of bread & wine remain unalter'd: The *Council* of *Trent* declares there is no change in these; * *manentibus speciebus panis & vini.* If therefore the *Fathers* use sometimes this vulgar notion of *Substance*, what wonder is it if sometimes they tell us, that the *nature* or the *Substance* is the same? What wonder is it, if *S. Chrysostom* in his epistle to *Cesarius*, write thus? *As before Consecration we call it Bread, but after it is no longer call'd Bread but the Body of our Lord, although the Nature of Bread remains in it; and it dos not become two Bodies but one Body of Christ: So here the Divine Nature being joyn'd to the Human, they both make one Son, & one Person.* By the *Nature* of a Body we usually aprehend no more than the exteriour qualities which we discover by our *Senses*; And when we find

* *Sess.* 13. *can.* 2.

find a change in these, we usually say the *Nature* changes, although the *Body* still remain the same. And, by the same rule, when the accidents make still the same impression upon our Senses, although the Body by a miracle be chang'd, we say the *Nature* is the same. Besides, These very words, which are produc'd against us, shew clearly that *S Chrysostom* distinguishes betwixt the *Nature* of bread, & the *Body* of bread. Dos not he say that although the *Nature* or accidents of Bread remain, yet the *Body* or Substance of bread dos not remain; because there remains but *One Body*; and this *one Body*, if we believe him, is not the *Body* of bread, but the *Body of Christ*?

* With as little reason they triumph because *Theodoret* says in his 2. Dialogue; *The mystical Symboles remain in their former Substance form & figure, & may be seen & toucht as before*: And *Gelasius*, in his book *De duabus in Christo naturis*, says, *the Substance or Nature of bread & wine dos not cease.... they remain in the propriety of their Nature.*

* *Theodoret* dos not speak of the

corporeal Subſtance of bread by which it differs from a *Spirit*; but expreſsly names the *myſtical Symboles* which are the *outward forms* & *accidents* of bread & wine: And *Gelaſius* urging the ſame argument againſt the *Eutychians*, uſes the word *Subſtance* only once, and the word *Nature* twice, to let us ſee that by the *Subſtance* of the *myſtical Symboles*, or (as he calls them) *the Sacraments which we receive*, he only means the *nature* or the *eſſence* of the *ſenſible Accidents*.

* And now I deſire to know what wonder there is in all this? Is it any unheard of News to Men of Letters, that ſuch words as *ſubſtance*, *nature*, *eſſence*, are promiſcuouſly made uſe of, even by *Philoſophers*? and that, by them, they mean to ſignifie the notion of any other *predicament*, or any *real being*, as well as that of *ſubſtance*? *S. Auſtin* was undoubtedly a great *Philoſopher*, & yet He calls every *real Being* by the name of *Subſtance*. In his *Enarration* upon the 68. *Pſalm*, he ſays, *Quod nulla ſubſtantia eſt, nihil omnino eſt: That which has no ſubſtance is nothing at all.*

* If this be true (you'l ſay) their argument

argument againſt the *Eutychians* will be good for nothing. Excuſe me. The *Eutychians* held that there was onely *One Nature* in *Chriſt*, becauſe they were pleas'd to fancy that his human nature was abſorpt in the Divinity & chang'd into it. To prove the ſubſtantial change of human nature into the Divinity, they argued from the miraculous change of bread into the body of *Chriſt*; which argument they never would have urged, if they had not known that the Catholicks of that Age believ'd the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*. *Theodoret* and *Gelaſius* anſwer, that the *outward forms* of bread & wine remain the ſame as formerly; from whence it follows evidently that, not only the *accidents* of *human nature* but alſo, the very *ſubſtance* of it, ſtill remains in *Chriſt*: Becauſe the *accidents* of *human nature*, ſeparated from the *ſubſtance* of it, are neither capable of *hypoſtatick union* with *God*, nor of exerciſing the *vital operations* of a *Man*. But many learned men who read *Gelaſius* and *Theodoret*, want either skill or patience to underſtand them. They find theſe words, *the ſubſtance of bread remains*, and

and are so much transported with the joyfull news of any thing that looks but like an argument against the *Old Religion* they have undertaken to *reform*; they do not well consider what the word may signifie, but willingly suppose the Sense is just the same as they would have it; set their hearts at rest; and look no farther.

* I have now sufficiently examin'd what the *Fathers* say concerning the *outward form* of the *Sacrament*; what they mean by calling it a *type*, a *sign*, or *figure*; & what they understand when they call it the *substance* or *nature* of bread. I now come close to the main point of the *Question*: What they have taught & constantly believ'd, during the first eight *Centuries*, concerning the *inward substance* of the *Sacrament*; Whether they believ'd it was the *substance* of *bread* & *wine*, or the *substance* of *Christ's body* & *blood*?

SECOND PART.

Paschasius Ratbertus a French Monk, Native of *Soisson* in *Picardy*, wrote a book, in the year 831. *de Corpore & Sanguine Domini*, at the request of one of

of his Scholars, call'd *Placidius*, an Abbot, to whom he dedicated it. He makes it his buſineſs to explain & prove three points: 1. that the body & blood of *Chriſt* are truly and ſubſtantially preſent; 2. that the *ſubſtances* of bread & wine remain no longer after *Conſecration*; 3. that the *body* is the very *ſame* which was born of the Virgin, ſuffer'd on the Croſs, & roſe from the Sepulcre. He was the more willing to write this book, becauſe ſome people out of ignorance began to doubt of ſeveral truths relating to the *Sacrament*. This I gather from an epiſtle of *Paſchaſius* to *Frudegard*, where I find theſe words, *Although ſome people are out of ignorance miſtaken, nevertheleſs as yet no body openly contradicts this doctrine, which all the World believes & profeſſes.*

Our Adverſaries take a great deal of pains to perſuade us, that *Paſchaſius* was the firſt broacher of this Doctrine; from him they date the firſt Riſe of it, about the beginning of the IX. Age, although it did not take root nor was fully ſettled & eſtabliſhed, till towards the end of the eleventh.

venth. They add; that this was the most likely time for the Enemy to sow his Tares, when the *Christian* World was lull'd asleep in ignorance and superstition; that the generality of people, being quiet & secure, were ready to receive any thing that came in under a pretence of mystery in religion; but the men most eminent for piety & learning in that time made great resistance against it. This is the Account which now is generally given by our modern Writers, and particularly by the *Author of a* late *Discourse against Transubstantiation.*

Tis easily said; and the contrary is as easily prov'd. Read *Leo Allatius* in his 3. book of the perpetual agreement betwixt East & West, and you will find *Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople* saying, that the bread & wine *are not an image or a figure*, but that *they are transmuted into the body & blood of Christ.* Read *Haymo* Bishop of *Halberstadt* in his Treatise *De Corpore & Sanguine Domini*, (you may find it in the 12. Tome, of the *Spicilegium*) his words are these; *We believe therefore, and faithfully confess & hold, that the substance of*

of bread & wine, by the operation of the Divine Virtue, is ſubſtantially chang'd into another ſubſtance, that is, Body & Blood..... The taſt of bread & wine remains, & the figure; the nature of the ſubſtances being wholly chang'd into the body & blood of Chriſt. Read *Theodorus* de *Abucara*, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* printed at *Lions*, you will find that in his 22. *Opuſcule* he ſays, *The Holy Ghoſt deſcends, & by his Divinity changes the bread & wine into the body & blood of Chriſt.* I omit ſeveral others, who lived in the ſame Age with *Paſchaſius*, and all witneſs that the *Church* believd the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation.* Tis well known that the 3. part of *Paſchaſius's* doctrine occaſion'd ſome diſputes about the manner of ſpeaking. They allow'd the body to be the *ſame* in ſubſtance, but not altogether the ſame; becauſe it is not in the ſame form; it has no corporal motion or action; in a word, it is preſent (in ſome reſpects) after the manner of a ſpirit, imperceptible to Senſe, all in the whole & all in every part. This *Spiritual* preſence of his body was much urg'd againſt *Paſchaſius* to prove,

prove, the body is not *absolutely* the *same*: But nevertheleſs, if we do not preferr darkneſs before light, we cannot but ſee that They who wrote againſt the third part, did not write againſt the ſecond; and they, who quarreld with his way of ſpeaking, did not deny the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*; as appears by the teſtimonies of his pretended Adverſaries. *Amalarius* in the 24. ch. of his 3. book, ſays *We believe the ſimple nature of bread & wine mixt* (with water) *to be chang'd into a reaſonable nature, to wit, the body & blood of Chriſt.* *Rabanus* Archbiſhop of *Mentz* in the 10. ch. of his 7. book, to *Theotmarus*, *De ſacris ordinibus*; *Who*, ſays he, *would ever have believ'd that bread could have been chang'd into fleſh, & wine into blood, unleſs our Saviour himſelf had ſaid it, who created bread & wine & all things out of nothing?* Theſe men were alſo Authors of the ſame IX. Age; And after all theſe teſtimonies I leave you to judge whether the IX. Age did not generally believe the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*; or whether *Paſchaſius* was the firſt that broacht it in the Weſtern Church.

I do not insist upon the authority of *Bertram* either one way or other: but however I shall give you a short account of him, as much as may suffice to justifie my letting him alone. The first question, which he proposes in the beginning, is * *whether the body of Christ be done in a mystery, or in truth? that is to say*, according to his own words, *whether it contain some secret thing, or whether the bodily sight do outwardly behold whatsoever is done?* I have not hitherto met with any Author of the IX. Age, that ever said, Our eye sees all that our faith believes: but we are to suppose that some body said so, or else that *Bertram* was mistaken. He answers, with a great deal of truth, that * *it cannot be call'd a mystery wherein there is nothing covered with some veil & removed from our bodily senses. Outwardly*, says he, *the form of bread is set out, but inwardly a thing far differing, * which is not discern'd to be Christ's body by the carnal senses.* Afterward he compares this *Sacrament* with that of *Baptism*; and finally in the 18. *page* he concludes; *Therefore the*

* pag. 1. * p. 5. * p. 6. *London-Edit.* 1687.

the things that are seen, & things that are believ'd, are not all one. This was indeed a mighty piece of business; and one would think that eighteen pages were little enough to prove, that things *visible* & things *invisible* are *not all one.* However the *Answer* is as wise as the *Question*, & dos not contradict the doctrine of *Transubstantiation.* His comparison of *Baptism*, though very unequal, is tolerable enough; and shews how, in all Sacraments, the inward virtue is distinguisht from the outward form. But when he begins to take a ramble among * *our Fathers that were under a Cloud*: when he inquires so seriously * *how the grosseness of a very thick air could sanctifie the people?* and tells us how * *the cloud gave out the cleanness of sanctification, in respect that it contain'd invisibly the sanctification of the Holy Ghost*: when he makes it an article of our faith * *to believe firmly* that in the Wilderness *Christ made the Manna & the Water of the Rock to become his own body & blood*, as truly and as effectually as now he changes the bread & wine: when he goes on, &

* *pag.* 18. * *pag.* 19. * *pag.* 22. * *pag.* 24.

& argues that * *even as he could* do the one *a little before he ſuffer'd, ſo likewiſe he was able to do the other* a great while before he was born: finally, when he tells us *further-more*, that the Sacramental bread & wine is as much turn'd into the *body* & * *blood of the believing people*, as into *the body & blood of Chriſt*; and proves it ſtoutly, becauſe *where there is but one ſanctification, there muſt needs follow the like myſtery*: When I conſider what ſtuff this is, and how he has put it together; I begin to think tis no great matter, either what he ſays, or what he would ſay if he could ſpeak. Several learned Men have taken pains to excuſe him, & to ſhew that all theſe inſtances were only intended to prove the difference betwixt the outward form & inward ſubſtance of the *Sacrament*. If this were all; I confeſs he might mean well; but He has expreſt himſelf ſo very ill, that (for my part) I do not think him worth quarreling for. I am very well contented to leave him as I find him, & to let our Adverſaries make the beſt they can of him. If He purſued his notions

* *pag.* 26. * *pag.* 68. 69.

notions too far, and left the *Church*, He was the firſt that ever did ſo, in this matter: and beſides, He wander'd by himſelf, for no body in the IX. Age follow'd him.

Let us now conſider the VIII. Age; And we ſhall ſee the ſtream of Truth run clearer, as we approach nigher the Fountain. *S. John Damaſcen* in his *Orthodox Faith*, 3. Book & 14. chapter, diſcourſes thus: *The Body truly joyn'd to the Divinity is that which was born of the Virgin; not that the Body, He aſſum'd, deſcends from heaven; but the bread it ſelf & wine are chang'd into the Body & Blood of God: which, if you ask, How it can be done? Tis enough for you to hear, it is done by the Holy Ghoſt ..... Nothing* ſays he, *is more clear and certain, than that God's word is true and efficacious and omnipotent ..... After a wonderfull manner they are chang'd into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and are not two, but one & the ſame .... Neither are the Bread & Wine a Figure of Chriſt's Body & Blood, but the Body it ſelf of our Lord, accompanied with his Divinity: For our Lord himſelf ſaid; This is, not a ſign of my Body,*

Body, but my Body; nor a ſign of my Blood, but my Blood.

Hitherto ye have heard *S. Iohn Damaſcen*; Pray, what do ye think of him? Do ye think that No body in the VIII. Age believ'd the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*? Well: but He was only one man. What ſay ye then, if I produce 350. more? I mean the 350. Bishops who ſate in the VII. general *Council*, call'd in the 87. year of the VIII. Age.

* The *Iconoclaſt* Hereticks would not allow any *relative* worship; and therefore refus'd all worship of any images but the *Euchariſt*. All other images of Chriſts Humanity, ſubſisting by themſelves, were (as they fancied) falſe images, and favour'd the Hereſie of *Neſtorius* who gave his Humanity a proper ſubſiſtence by it ſelf: But the outward form of the *Sacrament* not being a thing ſubſiſtent by it ſelf, but ſupported by the inviſible ſubſtance & Perſon of *Chriſt*, was a true image and might not only be retain'd but ador'd. So clear it is, that the *Iconoclaſts* did not deny *Tranſubſtantiation*; but, becauſe they believ'd it, therefore they allow'd the adoration

of

of the *Eucharist*. They say, indeed, the Sacramental bread must *not be figur'd in the shape of a human body, for fear of introducing Idolatry*; but they only fear'd the introducing of other Image-worship, given to other pictures of our *Saviour* which do not really contain *Him*. However, they did not speak their mind so plain, but that the *Council* doubted of their meaning: &, supposing that by the word *image* they understood an *empty sign*, the Bishops quarreld with the seeming contradiction of their terms, calling the *Eucharist*, sometimes *an Image, sometimes his Body*: And argued against them that *if it be an* empty *image, it cannot be this Divine Body*.

Read the VI. *Action*, and you will find the Judgment of the whole *Council* deliverd plainly in these words: *None of the Trumpets of the Holy Ghost, the holy Apostles and our illustrious Fathers, did ever call* [illegible] *an unbloody Sacrifice* [illegible] *an image of his Body. Neither did they learn of our Lord, so to say & confess* [illegible]: *He did not say, Take & eat the image of my Body*.... *The bread & wine, before they are sanctified, are call'd Types;*

but

but after their ſanctification they are properly call'd the Body & Blood of Chriſt: They are ſo, & are believ'd to be ſo. Theſe are the words of 350. Bishops, who all with one voice declare, They firmly believe that, what was bread before, is after conſecration properly *Chriſt's* body, & not only an image of it: And this is all we underſtand by *Tranſubſtantiation.*

So much for the VIII. Age. I come now to the 3. next Ages, the V. the VI. and VII. And becauſe the Reforming Party is willing to believe *S. Auſtin* favours them, we will begin with *S. Auſtin.* I am not ignorant that in his Writings upon the *Ghoſpel* of *S. John*, he copiouſly dilates upon the figurative ſenſe; and that in his 3. book *De Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ*, he ſays that the *Sacrament* is a figure of our Lord's Paſſion, which when we receive, we ought *to lay up in our memory, that his fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.* But on the other ſide, I know, that as when *S. Auſtin* ſays, in his 9. Tract upon *S. John*, that the converſion of water into wine was a figure of the ſpiritual converſion of the Law into the Ghoſpel, He dos not deny the ſubſtan-

tial change of water into wine; so when he says, the *Sacrament* is a figure of *Christ's* Passion, He dos not deny *Transubstantiation*. In the 9. ch. of his 2. book, *Contra Adv. Legis & Prophetarum*, he says, that *with faithfull hearts & mouths we receive the Mediatour of God & men Christ Jesus, giving us his flesh to eat, & his Blood to drink; although it seems more horrible, to eat man's flesh, than to kill it, or to drink man's blood, than to shed it.* In this place, he first distinguishes two ways of eating; oral, and spiritual; & then asserts them both. And I could wish they would take a little notice of this place, who so much please themselves with popular declamations against the pretended barbarousnes of this *Mystery*. In his *Comments* upon the 33. *Psalm*, He makes no difficulty of admitting all the real consequences of this mystery, which to our Adversaries seem absurd & impossible; as for example; that *Christ's* Body should be at the same time in two places, that he should hold himself in his own hand, give himself to his Disciples, keep himself to himself, & the like. First he moves the difficulty: *Who is carried in his own hands?*

hands? In another's hands one may be carried; No man is carried in his own. Afterwards he answers, *Christ was carried in his own hands; when commending* to them *his own Body, He said, This is my Body; For he carried that Body in his own hands.* I will only mention one more testimony of this *Father*; but so plain a one, that 'tis impossible any man in his wits should have utter'd if he had not believ'd the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation*. In his *Comments* upon the 98. *Psalm*; *Christ*, says he, *took flesh of the flesh of Mary; in this flesh he walkt here with us; this flesh he gave us to eat, that we may be saved: No body eats this flesh, but first Adores it.* Observe his words: He plainly speaks of *oral* eating; he dos not mean only *believing*: if he did, he would not say, we always *adore* before we *eat*; because 'tis evident, we do not *adore* before we *believe*. Pray, what is this we adore before we eat? is it only a piece of bread, a wafer, a sacred figure of *Christ's* body? Surely you will not make *S. Austin*, & all the *Christians* of his time, Idolaters? Adore a thing which they believ'd was not their God? No, no: They believ'd that although before

the words of Consecration it was only a piece of bread, yet after Consecration it was by God's Omnipotence substantially chang'd into the Body of *Christ*, & so became their *God* as well as their *Food*; And therefore the Christians of that Age ador'd the *Sacrament* before they durst approach to eat it; & *S. Austin* was so zealous for this *Adoration*, that he says in the same place, *It is not only lawfull to adore, but a Sin not to adore.*

The Dispute that was betwixt *Nestorius* & *S Cyril* of *Alexandria*, plainly shews that in those times this mystery was universally believ'd. *Nestorius* fancied there were two persons in *Christ*, the one true *God*, the other true *Man*, and pretended to prove that the *Flesh* of *Christ* and his *Divinity* are not united in one Person. The *Scripture* plainly told him that we eat the *Flesh* of *Christ*; But, said he, We do not eat the *Divinity*; Therefore the *Flesh* & the *Divinity* are not united in one Person. If *S. Cyril* had believ'd that what we *eat* with our mouths is meer bread, He might easily have answerd; That this argument only proves, the nature of *bread* & the Divine nature are not united

ted in one Perſon. But, becauſe he believ'd that the *Sacrament* which ſeems meer bread, is not any longer *bread*, but the true *ſubſtance* of *Chriſt's Body*; therefore he anſwerd that *although we do not eat the Divine Nature, yet the holy Flesh of Chriſt is not common Flesh .... 'tis the proper Body of the Word, which gives life to all things.* This *Argument* and *Anſwer* you may read in his *Apology* for his *Anathema's*. The *Catholiks* & the *Neſtorians* both agreed in the common belief, that the *Sacrament* is not *bread*, but the *Flesh* of *Chriſt*: Otherwiſe *Neſtorius* had been the moſt ſilly Diſputant that ever liv'd, & *S. Cyril* had been quite infatuated that did not give another Anſwer. *Neſtorius* argued: We do not *eat* the *Divinity*; Therefore the *Flesh* is not united to the *Divine Perſon*. *S. Cyril* anſwerd: The *Flesh*, which we eat, *gives life*; therefore 'tis united to the *Divine Perſon*; without which it *profiteth nothing*, according to our *Saviour's* words in the ſixth chapter of *S. John*.

Gelaſius Biſhop of *Cyzicus* in his book *De duabus in Chriſto Naturis*, proves againſt the *Eutychians* that there are two Natures in *Chriſt*; Becauſe in the *Sa-*

crament there are two natures, to wit, the visible nature of the outward forms, and the invisible nature of *Christ's substance:* And explicating how this is perform'd, he says; *The Bread & Wine are chang'd, by the Operation of the Holy Ghost, into the Divine substance.* The Accidents of bread & wine *remain* according to *Gelasius*, *in the propriety of their Nature*, but yet *the bread & wine are chang'd into the Divine Substance.* Think a little of this; and tell me, what it is, if it be not *Transubstantiation.*

Theodoret in his first *Dialogue*, taking notice how *Jacob* in the 49. of *Genesis*, gave our *Saviour's* Blood the name of *Wine*, and our *Saviour* in the *Ghospel* gave Wine the name of his *Blood*, He says, *The reason is manifest*; because *he would have those who partake of the divine mysteries, not to mind the Nature of the things which are seen; but, by the change of names, believe the change which is made by grace.* In the second *Dialogue*, he says of the *Sacramental* bread & wine: *They are understood to be, what they are made to be; and are believ'd to be such; and are Ador'd, because they are the same which we believe them to be.* In the first *Dialogue*, he

he says, the Sacramental bread *is chang'd*; In the second, he says, *it is ador'd*. What *change* is this which makes the Sacramental bread deserve to be *ador'd*? Consider it a while, and you will find it nothing else but *Transubstantiation*.

I should be tedious, if I undertook to lay before you all the Testimonies of the Fathers who, in these three Ages, have writ upon this subject. These which I have produc'd already, are beyond exception: They declare the *Faith* of the Ages they liv'd in; They say the *Sacramental* bread is chang'd into the *Substance* of *Christ*; They say, No body eats it, but first adores it; They say it is a Sin not to adore it: All this They say, & this is all we understand by *Transubstantiation*.

I come now to the first four *Centuries*, and put the Question to those *Fathers* who had the happyness to flourish in the best & purest times of *Christianity*; Whether the *inward Substance* of the *Sacrament* be *bread* & *wine*, or whether it be the *Body* & *Blood* of Christ? If it be true, that the *inward Substance* of the *Sacrament* is really the *Body* or *Flesh* of *Christ*; it

follows evidently that it is no longer *Bread*: And, whether it be true, or no, is the Queſtion which the *Fathers* of the firſt four Ages are to anſwer.

S. Ignatius in his epiſtle to the Romans, ſpeaking of this *bread of God*, ſays *it is the Flesh of Jeſus Chriſt.*

S. Juſtin martyr, in his *Apology* to *Antoninus Pius*, ſays, *We are taught that it is the Body & Blood of Jeſus Incarnate.*

S. Ireneus in his fifth book *againſt hereſies*, ch 11. ſpeaking of the bread & wine, ſays that *by the word of God they are made the Euchariſt which is the Body & Blood of Chriſt.*

Origen in his 7. *homilie* upon the 6. of *Numbers*, ſays *Then in a figure, Manna was their meat; but now, in reality, the Flesh of God the Word is our true meat.*

Optatus, in his 6. book againſt *Parmenian*, gives the *Sacrament* no other name: *What is the Altar?* (ſays he) but the ſeat of *Chriſt's Body & Blood?* He repeats it over & over again; And, if all the while he meant only a *figure*, 'tis ſtrange he ſhould never call it by the right name.

S. Ephrem the Deacon, in his book,

De

De Naturâ Dei curiosè non ſcrutandâ; ſays, *Our Saviour has given us his Body & Blood*; and that this gift of his *exceeds all admiration, all expreſſion, all underſtanding*: Which he would never have ſaid, if he had thought it had been but a *figure*.

To all theſe proofs, & ſeveral more which I omit, the *Author* of a late *Dialogue* in which the myſteries of *Trinity* & *Tranſubſtantiation* are compared, returns this anſwer: that the *Reformers* themſelves generally ſay the *Euchariſt* is the *Body* of *Chriſt*; And yet they all deny the myſtery of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

This is ſoon ſaid; & amounts to no more than this: That the Reformers ſay as we do, & think otherwiſe; They ſay, *it is* his body; & they think, *it is not*. But you muſt give me leave to tell you, that although their words look one way & their thoughts another; I have no reaſon to ſuſpect this fallacy of ſpeech in the good *Fathers* of the firſt four *Centuries*. What they receiv'd, in plain terms, from our *Saviour* & his *Apoſtles*, They deliverd with the ſame ſincerity & candour to ſucceeding Ages. Hear what *S. Hilary*

of *Poictiers* tells you, in his 8. book *De Trinitate*, where taking notice of our *Saviour's* words in the 6. ch. of *S. John*, He says, *There is no place left for doubting of the Truth of his Body & Blood; for now, by our Lord's Profession, & our Faith, 'tis truly his Body, & truly his Blood.* Hear *S. Epiphanius* in his *Ancorat*; where, to oppose the Allegorical Sense of *Origen* in the Creation of *Paradise*, He alledges several places out of *Scripture*; which, though they are hard to understand, are universally believ'd in the plain literal sense. Amongst the rest he produces the example of the *Eucharist*, & thus discourses upon it: *We see it is not equal, nor like* the Body of *Christ*; & yet our *Saviour would pronounce, This is my Body; Nor is there any one who dos not believe these words of his: For he, who dos not believe them to be true, falls absolutely from the state of Grace & of Salvation.* What think ye of this? Do ye think these great Men did not understand the faith of the Age they lived in? Do ye think they were not able to inform the World, concerning the *Faith* of former Ages, much better than

than our late Reformers, who came into the World above a thousand years after them? They tell us, The literal Sense is matter of *Faith*; & that they who do not believe it are neither in the *State of Grace*, *nor of Salvation*.

If it be said, that any *Real Presence* of *Christ's* Body, or the *Impanation* of his *Person*, is enough: What need is there of *Transubstantiation* to verifie the *literal Sense*? The Answer is obvious & clear. 1. Our *Saviour* did not say, My Body *is here*, but *This is* my Body: And although any *real presence* is enough to make good the *former* Assertion, yet nothing less than a *Substantial change* can verifie the *later*. 2. Although by virtue of an *hypostatick* union, it may be as true to say, *This bread is Christ*, as to say, *This Man is God*; yet still 'twill be as false to say, *This Bread is the Body of Christ*, as to say, *This Humanity is the Divinity*. Besides, it falls out a little unluckily that this Invention, only serves to pull down the old *Transubstantiation*, & to set up a new one; by changing the *Subsistence* of bread, into the divine *Subsistence*, the *Second Person* of the *B. Trinity*.

It cannot be litterally verified that *This Bread* (or *This thing* which was bread) *is the Flesh of Christ*; unless the bread be chang'd into his flesh; that is, cease to be bread, and begin to be his flesh: And this is the substantial change which we call *Transubstantiation*. There are two sorts of changes: one *accidental*, as when cold water is made warm; another *substantial*, as when our *Saviour* chang'd water into wine. An accidental change may warm the water; but only a substantial change can make it wine. In the same manner, an accidental change may make *bread* a *Sacrament*, but nothing less than a substantial change can make it the *Flesh* or *Body* of *Christ*.

* The *Fathers* often compare these changes, but never confound the one with the other. *S. Cyril* of *Hierusalem* in his 1. *Mystagogick Catechise*, observes that, *as Bread, by invocation of the Trinity, is made the Body of Christ*; so meats offer'd to Devils are *made impure* by invocation of them. In his 3. *Catechise*, he says; *As bread, after the invocation, is the Body of Christ*, so the Oyntment after consecration *is the Chrisme of Christ*. *S. Ambrose*

Ambroſe in his 4. book *De Sacramentis*, ch. 4. proves that *Chriſt* can effect great changes above nature, becauſe by his grace *We are new Creatures in Him.* But yet the *Fathers* do not ſay, Theſe changes are equal to That by which Bread is made the Body of *Chriſt.* Theſe Aſſertions, *This meat is impure, This oyntment is the Chriſm of Chriſt, This man is a new creature in Chriſt*; All This is evidently verified in the plain literal Senſe by a meer *accidental change*: But when the Fathers ſay, *This bread is the Fleſh of Chriſt*, Nothing but a *ſubſtantial change* can verifie the plain Senſe of the Letter; Nothing can make it literally true but *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Bread is one Body, one corporeal Subſtance: The *Fleſh* of *Chriſt* is another Body, another corporeal Subſtance. Change that into this; You change one *Body* into another, one *Subſtance* into another; And then, I pray, What change is this, if it be not *Subſtantial*? What is it, if it be not *Tranſubſtantiation*? Tis clear, that when the Fathers of the firſt four Ages ſpeak of the wonderfull change made in the *Sacrament*, they ſpeak of the change

change of *Bread* into the *Flesh* or *Body* of *Chriſt*; They ſpeak not, of an *Accidental* change, but a *Subſtantial* one, which now the Church calls *Tranſubſtantiation*: And therefore I have nothing more to do but cite the *Fathers* words, & ſo conclude.

S. Gaudentius is his 2. *Tract* upon *Exodus*, ſays, *He, the Creator & Lord of Nature, who produces bread out of the earth, produces alſo his own proper body out of bread, becauſe he can do it, & promis'd to do it: And He who produc'd wine out of water, produces alſo his blood out of wine.... For when he gave the conſecrated bread & wine to his diſciples, He ſaid; This is my Body, This is my Blood. Let us believe him whom we have believ'd; Truth cannot tell a lie.*

S. Chryſoſtom in his 83. *homilie* upon *S. Matthew*, has theſe excellent words; *Let us every where believe God Almighty; nor contradict him, although what He ſays ſeem contrary to our Reaſon and our Eyes.... His word cannot deceive us; Our Senſe is eaſily deceiv'd: That never erres, This often is miſtaken. Since therefore He ſays, This is my Body; Let us be perſuaded*

ded of it, & believe it.... Theſe are not the works of human power. He who did theſe things at his laſt ſupper, He it is who now performs them. We only are his Miniſters; 'tis He that Sanctifies, He that Tranſmutes the bread & wine into his Body & Blood. So that, as the ſame *Saint* ſays in his 25. *homily* upon the 1. to the *Corinthians*, *That, which is in the Chalice, is that which flow'd from his ſide, & that we are partakers of.*

S. Ambroſe in his book *De his qui myſteriis initiantur*; ch. 9. *Perhaps you'l ſay*, ſays he, *I ſee quite another thing: How do you aſſure me that I receive the Body of Chriſt? And this is that which remains for us to prove. How great*, ſays he, *are the examples which we uſe to ſhew, that it is not the thing which Nature form'd, but the thing which the Bleſſing has conſecrated; and that the Bleſſing has greater force than Nature; becauſe, by the Bleſſing, even the Nature it ſelf is chang'd.* Afterwards He inſtances in the change of *rods* into *Serpents*, and of *water* into *blood*; and thus purſues his diſcourſe. *If*, ſays he, *the word of Elias was powerfull enough to command*

mand fire down from Heaven, shall not the word of Christ be able to change the Nature of the Elements? You have read, of the whole Creation; He said, & they were made, He commanded, & they were created: The Word therefore of Christ, which could make out of nothing that which was not; cannot it change those things which are, into what they were not?

S. Gregory Nyssen in his *Catechistical Discourse*, ch. 37. professes the same faith: *I do believe*, says he, *that by the word of God, the Sanctified bread is transmuted into the Body of God the Word ... Not that by mediation of nourishment it becomes the body of the Word; but that immediatly by the Word it is transmuted into his body, by these words, This is my Body.... the Nature of the things, which appear, being transelemented*, that is, transubstantiated, *into it.*

S. Cyril Patriarch of *Hierusalem*, in his 4. *Mystagogick Catechise*, discourses thus: *Do not consider it as meer bread & wine; for now it is the Body & Blood of Christ according to our Lord's own words. Although your Sense suggest* otherwise, *let your faith confirm.*

confirm you, that you may not judge the thing by the Taſt.... and a little after, he goes on; *knowing*, ſays he, *& holding for certain, that the bread which we ſee, is not bread, although it taſt like bread; & the wine which we ſee, is not wine, although it taſt like wine.* *S. Hierome* in his *Catalogue*, & *Theodoret* in his 2. *Dialogue*, are witneſſes that *S. Cyril* was the Author of this work. And now I appeal to the judgment of my Auditory, whether I may not venture to defy any *Catholick* of this preſent Age, to expreſs in plainer terms our Faith of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

* However, Tis very ſtrange, (you'l ſay) if this were the faith of the firſt Ages, that None of the *Heathens*, nor ſo much as *Julian* the *Apoſtat*, ſhould take notice of it. This, if we believe a late Author, *is to a wiſe man inſtead of a thouſand Demonſtrations, that no ſuch doctrine was then believ'd.*

* As for *Julian* the *Apoſtat*; Of three books, which he wrote, we have but one, & that imperfect. Had he objected it, 'tis certain *S. Cyril* of *Alexandria* never would have taken

taken notice of it in his *Answer*: So cautious he is in speaking, even of *Baptism*, that he passes it over in these terms; *I should say many more things.... if I did not fear the ears of the profane. For commonly they laugh at things they cannot understand.*

* As for the *Heathens*, 'tis sufficient to reflect what care was taken by the primitive *Christians* to hide the mysteries of our Religion, & to keep our books out of the hands of Infidels. This privacy of ours made *Celsus* call our Doctrine *Clancular*: and *Origen*, in his first book against him, answers that *it is proper, not only to Christian Doctrine, but also to Philosophy, to have some things in it, which are not communicated to every one. Tertullian*, in his 2. book, *Ad Uxorem*, ch. 5. for this reason, would not allow *Christian* women to marry *Pagan* husbands: *will not your Husband*, says he, *know what you tast in Secret, before you eat of any other meat*? And *S. Basil* in his book Concerning the *Holy Ghost*, ch. 27. says, that *The Apostles & Fathers in the beginning of the Church, by privacy*

vacy & ſilence preſerv'd the dignity of their Myſteries.

* But, becauſe my Author thinks this Demonſtration *worth a Thouſand*, I am the more willing to anſwer him in his own words, that *though I have untied the knot, I could with more eaſe have cut it. For ſince 'tis plain & evident* from all the Records of the firſt eight Centuries, that *Tranſubſtantiation* always was believ'd, *it is the wildeſt, and the moſt extravagant thing in the world to ſet up a pretended Demonſtration of Reaſon againſt plain experience & matter of Fact. This is juſt like Zeno's Demonſtration againſt Motion, when Diogenes walkt before his eyes. A man may demonſtrate till his head & heart ake, before he ſhall ever be able to prove, that which certainly was, never to have been. All the Reaſon in the World is too weak to Cope with ſo tough & obſtinate a difficulty.*

I have now perform'd my promiſe. I have in three Sermons prov'd; 1. that *Tranſubſtantiation* is neither *contrary* to *Senſe* nor *Reaſon*; 2. that it follows clearly from the plaineſt words

in

in *Scripture*; 3. that it has been the perpetual *faith* of the *Catholick Church*, not only since *Paſchaſius*, but ever ſince the firſt foundation of *Chriſtian Religion*. And now I not only beg of you, but earneſtly conjure you by all that ought to be moſt dear to you, by all your deſires & expectations of eternal Happyneſs, to conſider ſeriouſly & leiſurely three fundamental principles of *Chriſtianity*.

1. That *without Faith 'tis impoſſible to pleaſe God*. They are the words of *S. Paul* to the *Hebrews*, ch. 11. v. 16.

2. That *there is but one Body, one Spirit, ... one Lord, one Faith*. They are the words of the ſame *Apoſtle* to the *Epheſians*, ch. 4. v. 4. & 5.

3. That we ought to follow the Direction of this *one Lord*, to find out this *one Faith*. This Direction is written in the Prophet *Jeremy*, ch 6. v. 16. *Thus ſays the Lord: ſtand in the ways & ſee; And ask for the Old Paths, where is the good Way, & walk therein; and you ſhall find reſt for your ſouls*.

Tis natural for men to pleaſe them-

themſelves with thinking how much they are wiſer than their Predeceſſours. Nothing is more agreable to Man's proud inclinations, than to be always finding faults & giving magiſterial directions for the mending of them: And this is that which makes the very Name of Reformation pleaſing & delightfull. To give it its due; Reforming is a pretty Thing, if it were well applied. If every Man would make it his chief buſineſs to reform himſelf; O! what a Happy Reformation should we live to ſee! But this alas, is much the ſmalleſt part of all our Buſineſs. There is no Vanity, no Pleaſure, in Reforming of our ſelves: We only gain a Victory where we deſire it not; & only triumph over our own faults. A proud man would as willingly ſit out, as play at ſuch ſmall game as this: All his delight is to reform his Neighbours. And here, I muſt confeſs, if Men were only a little overbuſy in reforming of their neighbours *Manners*, the Folly of their Pride were in ſome meaſure tolerable. But when our inſolence attempts the Reformation of their *Faith*,

&

& of that *Church* to which *Divine* as well as *Human* Laws require *Obedience* and *Submission*; the ſpecious Name & popular Fretence will never ſanctifie the Crime. If they who, in the laſt Age, undertook the Reformation of our *Church*, were known to be infallible; ſome grains of blind Obedience might be eaſily allow'd. But ſince they may perhaps be grievouſly miſtaken, it very much behoves you to conſider it. Tis a common ſaying; *if a man cheat me once, 'tis his fault; but if he cheat me twice, 'tis mine.* Tis not the firſt time that a conſiderable Party in the *Catholick Church* has ſeparated from the whole, upon theſe plauſible pretences of *Reformation*, to correct *Abuſes*, *Innovations*, & *Errours*. Did not the *Arians*, thirteen hundred years ſince, begin to ſeparate upon this popular pretence? Did not they, in the ſame manner, amuſe their *Proſelytes* with plauſible ſtories, of *errours*, *innovations*, and *abuſes*, crept into the *Church*? Did not they make as great a noiſe againſt the *Conſubſtantiality* of God the *Son*? complain as much of Spiritual *Tyranny*? inveigh

inveigh as much againſt the *Council* of *Nice* for making, introducing, and impoſing, a new, unheard of, *Article* of *Faith*: quite contrary to the belief of three preceding Ages, & plainly oppoſite to *Holy Writ*? All This, you know, was falſe: You know that, though the *word* was new, the *faith* was old & plainly prov'd by *Scripture*: And yet theſe popular noiſes which then the *Arians* buzz'd into the peoples ears, amuſed them ſo, They never entertain'd the leaſt ſuſpicion of their being cheated. Had our Reformers been the firſt, & you had been deceiv'd, The fault had then been theirs. But, ſince the ſame trick has been playd ſo often in the *Church*, if now you are deceiv'd, the fault is yours. I have laid before your eyes, this day, a proſpect of the eight firſt Ages. They accuſe the *Catholick Church* of making a new *Article* of *Faith*: And, by the moſt Authentick Records of Antiquity, it has been plainly prov'd that they themſelves are guilty of unmaking an old *Article* of *Faith*, as ancient as *Chriſt* & his *Apoſtles*. *Remember the days of old, Conſider*

the

the years of many generations; Ask thy Father, & he will shew thee; thy Elders, and They will tell thee. Stand in in the ways, & see; and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, & walk therein: There is no other *Way* which can conduct you safely to the Joys of Heaven; which I wish you all, *in the Name of the Father, Son, & Holy Ghost; Amen.*

* *When this Sermon was preacht before his Majesty, several paragraphs (which are all markt with a* * *) were omitted, for brevity sake; but are here printed, as they were found in the Author's papers.*

A SERMON

Preacht before their

MAIESTIES

AT WHITE-HALL.

April 23. 1688.

Printed by his Majesty's Order.

Sine me nihil poteſtis facere.
Without me you can do nothing.
Iohn. 15. 5.

THe principal difference betwixt the daring *Boldneſs* of a *Heathen* & the true *Valour* of a *Chriſtian*, Sacred MAJESTIES, conſiſts in this; The firſt is grounded in *Pride*, the ſecond in *Humility*: The firſt begins from a vain

Imagination of our own Sufficiency, as if we were able to do all things; The ſecond from a true Idea of our natural Weakneſs who are able to do nothing of our ſelves. This was the reaſon why our Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt* inſtructing his *Apoſtles*, thoſe great *Hero's* of the *Church*, was pleas'd to ſettle this foundation for the ſuperſtructure of their great & glorious Actions, *Without me you can do nothing.* That they might better underſtand it, He compar'd them to the branches of a Vine, which being ſeparated from the Root immediatly fade & wither without bringing fruit. *I am the Vine, you are the Branches*; Without me you are fruitleſs; Without *Humility* all that ſeems great & glorious is but a ſplendid *Bubble*, a meer empty *Nothing.*

All this, you'l ſay, is very true: *Humi'ity* is never out of Seaſon. But why ſo much of it in this Day's Goſpel? Why is it now in Seaſon, more than any other time? The Reaſon is; Becauſe no Virtue is ſo apt to puff us up with *Pride*, as *Fortitude.* A *Hero*, among men, is too often like *Lucifer*, among the Angels. From the Meridian of his aſpiring height, if he look down,

'tis

'tis with Contempt, if upward, 'tis with Emulation of being like the Higheſt. No wonder, whilſt he lives and flourishes, if he deſires to be like God; For, even when he is dead, Poſterity is apt to make him ſo. Hence 'tis, the *Hero's* of Antiquity have peopled an imaginary Heaven with ſo many *Deities*, and Mankind was ſo ignorantly Superſtitious as to offer *Sacrifices* to them. Had we not been inſtructed better by the Word of God, and particularly by the *Ghoſpel* of this Day; Our Nation, for ought I know, might have been guilty of the ſame extravagance: *S. George* might then, perhaps, have been a *God* among us. But ſince all *Catholicks*, are well acquainted with this great & fundamental Truth, contain'd in the words of my Text; *Without Chriſt* all the *Apoſtles*, all the *Saints* in Heaven, *can do Nothing*; The Knowledge of this Truth has dasht the hopes of Hell; the Gates of it can never prevail againſt us; We cannot, if we do not quite renounce our Faith, We cannot be in danger of ſo groſſe *Idolatry*. My firſt deſign, in this *Diſcourſe*, is to maintain the *Honour* which redounds upon *S. George* from

Solemnity we celebrate: My ſecond is, to ſhew the obligation incumbent upon all, & particularly thoſe of his Profeſſion, to follow his *Example*. That I may have ſucceſs in both, I ſhall endeavour to obtain the aſſiſtance of my *Saviour*, addreſſing my humble prayers to Him *without* whom *we are able to do Nothing*.

FIRST PART.

From a deep Senſe of this important Truth, which is the firſt foundation of *Chriſtian Humility*, the *Catholick Church* has ever been perſuaded that it is her Duty to appoint the Feſtivals of *Saints*, for theſe two reaſons: 1. to offer up our *humble Thanks* to God, for all the ſignal inſtances of his great *Power & Mercy*, all the *Favours* He ſo graciouſly beſtow'd upon his *Saints*, who *could do nothing* of themſelves: 2. to offer up our *humble Prayers* to God, that ſince we alſo are not able to do any thing without him, He may pleaſe to help us with proportionable Graces, ſuch as may enable us to follow their Example. Humble *Thankſgiving*, Humble *Prayer*,

Prayer, are the Duties of this Day. In the performance of the firſt, we raiſe our thoughts to Heaven, and contemplating this great *Saint* before the Throne of God (where he acknowledges, & renders *Thanks* for, all the miracles of *Grace*, which rais'd him to ſo high a Station of Glory there) we fall devoutly down upon our knees, with admiration of God's great Mercy, & *Thankſgiving* for the powerfull aſſiſtance which appear'd ſo ſignally in *him* who of himſelf was able to do Nothing. In the ſecond, we look down upon our ſelves, and conſcious of our Frailty we begin to *Pray* with all Humility, that ſince his Goodneſs has been heretofore ſo great, He may continue it to us: And, at the ſame time, this great *Saint*, remembering the danger he has eſcap'd, compaſſionates the danger we are in, & humbly *Prays* that ſince the ſame Redeemer died for him and us, the ſelfſame helps which carried on the work of his Salvation may be employd in ours. Having thus fairly ſtated & divided the whole Duty of the *Day*, I ſhall proceed to juſtifie the *Honour* which from hence redounds

upon the *Saint* whoſe Feaſt we celebrate.

I need not tell you, that if any *Saint* deſerve a Feſtival in honour of his memory, *S. George* may very well expect it from us more than any other Nation. All *Chriſtendom* has been ambitious of his Patronage; and almoſt every Part been at a holy ſtrife with one another which ſhould honour him moſt. In *Portugal* they look upon him as the Souldier's Patron: In *Germany* we find a Military Order dedicated to him: In *Italy* we have ſeen the great decay of the *Italian* Souldiery recover'd by *S. George's* Regiment. In *Aſia* the *Georgians*, which way ſoever they employ their forces, carry with them a fair Banner with the Picture of *S. George* upon it. In the *Armenian* Churches they religiouſly obſerve his Feaſt. Among the *Greeks* they keep the ſame Solemnity; And they who travel in thoſe parts can hardly find two Churches in a Town whereof one is not dedicated to *S George*. Thus have all Countries ſtudied to outvie each other in the *Honour* of this *Saint*. But as the *Genius* of this Nation ſutes more than any with his proper Charac-

ter,

ter, We bid the faireſt for his Patronage. What *Saint* more proper to be Patron of a Warlike *Nation*, than a Warlike *Saint*? A Nation whoſe Valour has been always envied & admir'd by all the World, what could could they want to make them *Saints* as well as *Souldiers*, but the Patronage & great Example of *S. George*, a *Souldier* & a *Saint*?

But yet, I know not how it comes to paſſe, there are a certain ſort of people in the World ſo ſuperſtitiouſly over-jealous of *God's Honour* & ſo ſcrupulous in miſinterpreting their Duty to Him, that they dare not upon any terms allow the leaſt proportion of *Honour* to a *Saint*, for fear of giving *God* too little, & the *Saint* too much. I do not pretend to enter now into the Liſts of Diſputation; but only to preſent you ſome few obvious reflections, relating to the main Diſpute, which may contribute ſomething towards the removal of theſe groundleſs fears & ſcandalous miſapprehenſions.

In the firſt place; If we think as humbly and as meanly of the *Saint*, as he dos of himſelf, We cannot *therefore* be accounted guilty of Idolatry:

The *Saint* is then no more *our Idol* than he is *his own*. You cannot imagine that the *Saints* in Heaven idolize themſelves: If therefore we *eſteem* the *Saints* no more than they eſteem themſelves; There is no danger (upon this account) of honouring them too much. The *Saints* in Heaven are more *humble* now than ever. Tis true; They ſee God *face to face*; They ſee in him all they deſire to ſee: But yet this Knowledge dos not puff them up with *Pride*, becauſe they ſee in Him that He is *All*, & they are *Nothing*. They only *believ'd* it upon Earth; but now they plainly *ſee* it. *S. Paul* is now perſuaded more than ever, that * *if a man think himſelf to be Something, when he is Nothing, he deceives himſelf.* All the *Apoſtles* plainly ſee the Evidence of what our *Saviour* once taught them; *without me you are able to do nothing.* *S George* himſelf is now convinc'd, more ſenſibly than ever, of the *Prophet's* Doctrine; * *Let not the Mighty man glory in his Might*; Let not the daring *Hero* glory in his Courage; Let him rather humble himſelf ſo much the more in preſence of his God,

* *Gal.* 6. 3. * *Jerem.* 9. 23.

God, who made him Great. They *All* annihilate themſelves in preſence of their God, * *The Pillars of Heaven tremble* in his ſight; They *tremble*, not ſo much with fear, as with an awfull & profound *Humility*; They * *caſt* down *their Crowns before the Throne*; & All at once acknowledge they are *Nothing* of themſelves. Pauſe here one moment, & reflect *how little* the greateſt *Saints* eſteem themſelves: Reflect again; We value them *no more* than this; And then you will ingenuouſly confeſs, We do not value them *too much*.

In the ſecond place; if by our Feſtival *Thanksgiving* to their God & ours, We only honour them *as* they honour us; that is to ſay, *as Branches* of the ſelfſame *Vine* without which they, as well as we, are *able to do nothing*; Then, I ſuppoſe, we may conclude, We do not honour them above their merit. And, if we well examine the Deſign of theſe *Solemnities*; if we conſider nothing on the one ſide, but the Honour which accrews to them, becauſe we bear them company in giving *Thanks*; and, on the other ſide, the *Honour* which re-

* *Iob.* 26, 11. * *Apoc.* 4. 10.

dounds upon us by their gracious return of the like Kindneſs, their eſpouſing of our Cauſe, their joyning of their intereſt with ours; We ſhall find that, barely by our Feſtival *Thankſgiving-Days*, we only *honour* them *as* we are *honour'd* by them. Although *we celebrate* this Day *the Sacrifice of Maſs in memory & honour* of *S George*, * *we offer not the Sacrifice to* him, *but to God alone, who crown'd* him with immortal Glory; *offering our* humble *Thanks to God* both *for his Victory* & his Eternal *Triumph*. By our *Thankſgiving* we direct the *Sacrifice* no more to this great *Saint*, than to your Sacred MAJESTIES; for in the ſelf-ſame Sacrifice we offer our moſt hearty thanks to the ſame God for the ineſtimable Bleſſing of your Sacred MAJESTIES Coronation upon Earth, the Annual Solemnity of which returns this Day, with that of *S. George's* Coronation in Heaven. We joyn our *Thanks* with his; He joyns his *Prayers* with ours. If it be ſuch an *Honour* to this great & glorious *Saint*, that we poor *Sinners* bear him Company, attend, & wait upon him to the *Throne of Grace*, to offer up our *Thanks*

* *Council of Trent, ſeſſ.* 22, *chap.* 3.

Thanks with his: Conſider well, and tell me whether or no, it be not a great *Honour* to us miſerable *Sinners*, that this great & glorious *Saint* appears before us, introduces us, preſents us to our God & his, & offers up his Prayer, his Petition, his Addreſs with ours? Can you imagine a more honourable *Teſtimony of our Excellency*, than that the Bleſſed *Saints* in Heaven, notwithſtanding all their glorious advantages above poor *Sinners*, nevertheleſs eſteem ſo much, & ſet ſo great a value on, God's Image in us, as to offer up their humble Supplications for us, and to interpoſe with ſuch profound Humility betwixt our angry God & us, as if in Heaven they ſo highly priſed us, as to ſolemniſe *Humiliation-Days* in favour of us?

This, I confeſs, appears to me enough to counterballance all our *Holy-Day-Thankſgivings* upon Earth. But I have yet more weight to put into the Scale, which will not fail to bear it down. If it be ſuch an *Honour*, to the *Saints* above, that *Sinners* here below keep *Holy Days* to celebrate their *Victories* with marks of joy & thanks; ſurely we muſt allow that 'tis no little *Honour* to repentant *Sinners*, that the *Angels* and

Saints in Heaven celebrate, with jubilation and thanksgiving, all the *Victories* of Grace by which we overcome our Enemies on Earth. I do not say, They keep our *Holy-Days*; because all such expressions, transferr'd from Earth to Heaven, loose their sense, and we are always at a loss for words, when ever we pretend to talk of things so far above us: But yet I am inclin'd to think that all those Days, in which a Sinner is converted, are *Thanksgiving-Days* in Heaven: * *There is Joy in Heaven, There is Joy in presence of the Angels* & Saints *of God, over one Sinner that repenteth.* Consider this, and you will easily conclude that we receive great *honour*, whilst we give it; and that we are ungratefull, if we think we give too much.

In the third, & last place; if the *Honour* we allow to *Saints* be of the *self-same kind* with what we do to one another. We cannot then be reasonably scandaliz'd at the excess; we cannot, surely, be so vain as to imagine that a *Saint* in Heaven is not as deserving as a Sinner upon Earth. We dayly *pray to* one another, as we *pray to* them: The *Honour*

* *Luke.* 15. 7. & 10.

Honour is no more *Divine* when we *desire* the *Prayers* of a *Saint*, than when we beg the *Prayers* of a *Sinner*: We injure *Christ* no more when we demand their *intercession* there, than when we ask the *intercession* of our Neighbours here: The *Mediatourship* of *Christ* is ſtill the ſame, whether the *Prayers* of our *Friends* be *interpos'd* on *this* ſide, or on *t'other* ſide of Heaven.

I cannot but reflect, whilſt I am talking thus, it may perhaps appear a little ſtrange, that I employ my time to ſhew how little honour we allow our *Saint*, when many people are in expectation of a Panegyrick to perſuade them that they cannot honour him too much. But 'tis enough for me if I have done him juſtice. I am ſure our Saint deſires no more than he deſerves; And I have ſaid enough to prove that he deſerves as much as we allow him. By our *deſiring* of his *intercession* we do him no more honour than we do to one another. By our *Thanksgiving* for his Happyneſs, we only are ſo grateful, as to honour God in him, who honours God in us. By our *Conſideration* of his *Merit*, we conceive as humble an *Idea* of him, as our *Saint* dos of himſelf; and are, in that reſpect, as innocent as he.

O!

O! what a Joy it is to a dejected *Sinner*, that *S. George* himself was once a *Man* infirm & frail as well as we; & that the Difference which now we ſo admire betwixt him & our ſelves, is not in any Excellency he can boaſt of, but a pure effect of God's great Mercy to him. Tis true here, what *S. Bernard* ſaies upon the like occaſion; *This Man was once like us; fram'd of the ſame clay*, caſt in the ſame mould, and ſubject to the ſame infirmities of Flesh & Blood: *We have reaſon to rejoyce, & to be aſham'd: rejoyce that He is gone before us, & be aſham'd that*, though we may, *we will not follow his Example*; Which is an Obligation incumbent upon All, & particularly thoſe of his Profeſſion, as I ſhall ſhew you in the ſecond part of my Diſcourſe.

SECOND PART.

As Nothing is more difficult than for a man to be a *Souldier* and a *Saint*, So there is Nothing which our God appears more zealouſly concern'd for, than the Reputation of ſo great a Work; Nothing of which He is more jealous,

than

than leaſt the admiring World, whoſe eyes are dazled with the ſplendour of Heroick Actions, may rob Him of the *Honour*, & aſſume it to themſelves. He will not allow the *Branch* to glory in the *Fruit* it bears; becauſe it cannot *bear fruit* of it ſelf: Divide it from the *Vine*; it *withers* without Fruit, *Men gather* it, *make fire*, & *burn* it.

But, though the *Branch* be fruitleſs when tis ſeparated from the *Root*, Yet nevertheleſs as long as it remains united to the *Vine* it flourishes & fructifies: * *He who abides in me, brings forth much Fruit* * *This is the Victory*, ſays the Apoſtle, *by which we overcome the World*, *Our Faith* (I mean *Our Faith* in this our *Saviour's* Doctrine) that though *without* Him *We are able to do nothing*, Yet with his help we may be able to do all things: * *If you abide in me*, if you place all your truſt, your hope, & confidence in me, *ask what you will, it ſhall be done*. A Diffidence in our own ſtrength, A loving Confidence in God, is ſo agreable, it charmes him ſo, He in a manner

* *John.* 15.5. * 1, *John. ch.* 5. *v.* 4. * *John.* 15.7.

manner lends us his Omnipotence, and by his Grace enables us to conquer all things.

S. Paul, of all men living, had the leaſt opinion of his own ſufficiency; He confeſs'd he had not, of himſelf, the power to think ſo much as one good thought; And yet he doubted not but he was able to do all things by the Strength of Grace; * *I can do all things*, ſays he, *through Chriſt who ſtrengthens me.* Although he was not preſent when our *Saviour* encourag'd his *Apoſtles*, when He carefully fore-warn'd them of the dangerous Adventures they were like to meet with, when He told them that although their *Enemies* were *ſtrong* yet *He* was infinitely *ſtronger*; Although *S. Paul* was abſent when our *Saviour* gave them this Encouragement, he was as much aſſur'd of his Protection, as if he had been preſent, & had hear'd Him ſay, * *Take Courage, I have overcome the World.*

Nothing could be more ſeaſonable, than this *Comfort*, to a *Souldier*, who values above all things the Security of his *Salvation*, & deſires to be a *Saint.*

A

* *Phil.* 4. 13. * *John*, ch. 16. v. 33.

A *Souldier* & a *Saint* are things ſo hard to reconcile, that He who has the Courage to encounter any Death, & look it in the face as boldly as *S. George* himſelf, has ſeldom Courage to attempt the following of his Example, but concludes, that in ſo dangerous a ſtate of Life, 'tis morally impoſſible to be a *Saint*.

Tis not that Sober men are ſcrupulous upon the Quality of that *Profeſſion*; or that they think the *State of life* unlawfull. They know that when *S. John* the *Baptiſt* preacht *Repentance* to the People, & when the *Souldiers* came among the reſt to learn their *Duty*, He did not bid them throw away their Arms; he did not tell them their Vocation was criminal, he did not ſay that there was no *Salvation* for them if they did not quit thoſe dangerous occaſions of *Sin*: He only gave them ſuch Directions as were proper to their Calling; giving them to underſtand, that they ought * *not to Do violence*, But obſerve the Order of military Diſcipline, & *be Content with their Pay*.

They do not think it is a *Sin* to be

* *Luke ch. 3. v. 14.*

be a *Souldier*, but are afraid that 'tis almoſt impoſſible to be a *Souldier* without *Sinning*. Nor do they think that *Piety* is inconſiſtent with the *Courage* of a *Souldier*: They know that *Virtue* raiſes men above the fear of *Death*; and that No man ſo much contemns *this life* as he who values nothing but *the next*. But yet they obſerve & by their dayly obſervation find, the Circumſtances are extremely difficult in which a Military life engages them; and when they ſeriouſly compare their weakneſs on the one ſide with the difficulty on the other, they are almoſt ready to Deſpair.

To tell theſe men, The Grace of God is powerfull; to mind them, that although the Enemies of our Eternal Happyneſs are numerous & ſtrong, our *Saviour* by the power of his *Grace* has vanquisht all of them; and that he therefore bids them reaſſume their Courage, becauſe He has *overcome the World*: This, I confeſs, may be ſome comfort to them; though it be not perhaps enough to allay thoſe fears & apprehenſions which ariſe from the immenſe diſparity betwixt our God & us. Alas! what great encouragement to him,

him, who knows his frailty, to consider that our *Saviour Jesus Christ* has *overcome the world*? What wonder that a *Man*, who was true *God*, could conquer all his Enemies? Shew us a *Man*, say they, *infirm* and *frail*, whose *flesh* and *blood* are subject to the same *Corruptions* as ours; Let *such* a *Man* divide his whole life betwixt *Camp* & *Garrison*; And, if *He* notwithstanding all this *lives* and *dies* a *Saint*, then we shall have some hopes that we may be enabled by God's *Grace* to follow his *Example*.

If this be all they ask, if this will answer all their fears, and make them asham'd to plead such vain excuses for a loose & irreligious life; Let them reflect upon the great *Example* of the *Saint* whose *Feast* we celebrate. He was so much a *Souldier*, & so eminent in that *Profession*, that by the Splendour of his *Military* Virtues, he obscured & darkned all his other Excellencies: Nothing else appears upon the *Authentick Records* of his *Fame*; The rest lies buried in the *Rubbish* of *Antiquity*, under the *Trophees* of a *Souldier* & a *Saint*. He was no more a *God* than *we* are: setting aside God's *Grace*, he

was

was a man no better than the men he left behind him: And yet he *lived* and *died* a *Saint*: He now *triumphs* for all *Eternity* in *Heaven*: Thence He looks down upon us with a ſenſible compaſſion of their cowardly miſtake, who think it is impoſſible to follow his *Example*: And, if he might but ſpeak, He would exhort them, in our *Saviour's* words, *Take Courage I have overcome the World*: I, who when I lived on Earth, deſir'd as much, & more than you do, the Salvation of my ſoul; who had the ſelfsame fearfull apprehenſions, which you have, of the difficulties which occurr in ſuch a dangerous Vocation: I, who thought it almoſt impoſſible to be *Devout* in *Camp*, *Sober* in *Garriſon*, *Innocent* in ſuch corrupted *Converſation*; Nevertheleſs, by the aſſiſtance of God's *Grace* I came to be what now I am; *Take Courage*; I, as frail a man as you are, I have overcome the dangers which you are ſo much afraid of, *I have overcome the World.*

I have ſaid enough to ſhew that *Souldiers* may, if they pleaſe, be *Saints*: & nothing now remains, but this; that all good *Chriſtians*, all *Saints*, muſt of neceſſity

neceſſity be *Souldiers*. Tis not ſufficient that the *Souldier* follow the *Example* of the *Saint*; The *Saint* muſt alſo follow the *Example* of the *Souldier*. To let you ſee, there's no new myſtery in what I ſay, I take the liberty to lay before your eyes the *Field* of *Battel* which engages all the World, without exception, under one of theſe two *Standards*, either that of *Jeſus Chriſt*, or that of *Lucifer*. *S. Michael* had defeated him in *Heaven*; But however, upon Earth he reinforc'd his baſled ſtrength; and to make ſure of his intended Conqueſt of our *Paradiſe* below, he would not openly invade it, but ſurpris'd it, by a baſe inglorious treachery, without proclaiming War. Having thus poſſeſs'd himſelf of this low World, the Prince of Darkneſs govern'd it, he domineerd & tyranniz'd, till *Jeſus Chriſt* the *Son of God* appear'd againſt him; * *and was manifeſted, that he might deſtroy the works of the Devil*. He immediatly ſet up the *ſtandard* of the *Croſs*. Tis true; He preſs'd none to ſerve him; He only liſted Voluntiers; * *If any man will* (ſays he) *come after me Let*

* 1. *Io.* 3, 8. * *Math.* 16, 24.

Let him take up his Croſs, & follow me. But yet, to ſhew there's no *Neutrality* allowable in ſuch a *War*, He proclaim'd himſelf an *Enemy* to all that fought not for him; * *He who is not with me, is againſt me.*

The *Church*, in *Scripture*, is compared in ſeveral places, to a *Vineyard*, to a *Kingdom*, to an *Army*: To a *Vineyard*, becauſe under the care of one *Husbandman*; to a *Kingdom*, becauſe govern'd by one *Prince*, and to an *Army*, becauſe under the Conduct of one *General*. As in this *Vineyard* every *Branch abiding in the Vine* is *fruitfull*: As in this *Kingdom* every *good man* is a *Loyal Subject* to his *Prince*: So in this *Army* all *good Chriſtians* are *Souldiers*, fighting every one againſt the common *Enemy*, under the *Standard* and *Command* of *Jeſus Chriſt* our *General*.

Raiſe up your thoughts *above* the world: Conſider all the *Bleſſed Spirits* who are happy *there*: Aſſure your ſelves there is not one of them a *Saint* triumphant now in *Heaven*, who was not formerly a *Souldier* militant on *Earth*. *S. Paul* aſſures us, that there is

* *Math.* 12. 30.

is not one who wears a *Crown* of Glory *there*, but what he fought for *here*; * *He is not crown'd*, ſays he, *except he* have fought *lawfully*.

Our *Saviour* tells us in the *Goſpel* of *S. Luke*, Our Enemy the Devil is both * *Strong* and *Arm'd*: And is it not then the *Duty* of all *Chriſtians* to *arm* againſt him? Hear how *S Paul* deſcribes a *Chriſtian*, & tell me what he meant, if not a Souldier? * *Put on the whole Armour of God, your Loyns girded with Truth; taking the Shield of Faith*, and *the Helmet of Salvation*. And why all this? * *That you may be able to ſtand againſt the Devil*; the * *Old Serpent* whoſe Hiſtory begins in *Geneſis* and ends in the *Apocalypſe*.

S. George is always pictur'd fighting with a *Serpent*. The *Story*, which perhaps was firſt occaſion'd by the *Picture*, is a *Fable*: But however, if the *Maxim* of *Mythologiſts* be true, that there is ſeldom any *Fable* without ſome foundation in *Hiſtory*, we may believe the *Picture* is, * *at leaſt in part, Hiſtorical; as being thus contriv'd*

* 2. *Tim.* 2. 5. * *Luke.* 11. 21. * *Epheſ.* ch. 6. * *ibid.* * *Apoc.* 12. 9. * *D. Heylin. Hiſt. of S. G.*

triv'd of purpoſe (in thoſe times, & by thoſe men, who moſt affectionatly were devoted to our Martyr) to publish to Poſterity how bravely he refell'd the Devil, that *Old Serpent*, the old Enemy of Mankind; with how much courage he reſiſted all his violent aſſaults; And with how much conſtancy he ſtood immoveable * *in the profeſſion of his Faith: the whole Church praying with him, and kneeling (like the Virgin) by him, in that holy Action, that God would give him ſtrength* to live & die victorious in a *War* which all *good Chriſtians* are engaged in, & a *War* in which we all are equally oblig'd to follow the example of our *then* Victorious & *now* Triumphing *Saint*.

Whenſoever we ſee the *George* hang at the *Breaſt* of any *Knight* of that moſt noble & heroick *Order*, I could wish it would mind us, How happy all thoſe are who by a frequent memory of his *Example* wear a deep impreſſion of it in their *Hearts*. I cannot but admire the *Piety* of that great * *Prince*, the Glory of his Times, and Ornament of *Europe*, who in the Inſtitu-

* *ibid.* * *Edward III.*

Inſtitution of it, took ſuch care to recommend it, with ſuch marks of honour, to Poſterity. Nor can I paſs without reflection, how ſutable the *Statutes* are to the intention of the *Founder* & how well they anſwer his deſign; by ordering that the *George* be never laid aſide, although the other *Ornaments* upon occaſion may be let alone, and only are of obligation upon ſolemn Days. Becauſe the *Spiritual War*, in which all *Chriſtians* are *Souldiers*, is perpetual & without intermiſſion; Becauſe the *Devil*, like a cunning *Serpent*, always lies in ambush ready to ſurpriſe us; Becauſe he every day ſo frequently aſſaults us & obliges us to be upon our guard; Therefore the Image of this *Fighting Saint* muſt always be before their eyes, always appear upon their breaſts, & always awake the memory of thoſe, who, over & above the common tye of *Chriſtianity*, are by their *Knighthood* bound in honour not to lay aſide *S. George's* reſolution of encountring the infernal *Serpent*, the malicious *Enemy* of their Eternal Happyneſs, that ſo

they may at length receive an Everlasting Crown of Glory. And this is the reason why, at the *Investiture* of any of these *Knights*, when first the *George* is put about their Necks, the *Chancellor* of the *Order* reads an *Admonition* importing that They *wear the Image of the Blessed Souldier of Christ, S. George*, to the end *that by his imitation* they may be *provok'd*, and *having stoutly vanquisht their Enemies both of Body & Soul*, they *may not only receive the praise of this transient Combat, but be crown'd with the Palm of Eternal Victory.* Not only They whose *Dignity* entitles them to wear the *George* upon their *Breasts*, but All who with respect behold it there, are animated & instructed by it, to discharge the Essential *Duty* of a *Christian*, whose Life is a continual Warfare upon Earth.

S. George himself had never been *Victorious* without God's *Grace. Without Christ*, he had been *able to do Nothing.* The very same *Grace* we may have for asking, if we are sincere. The whole *Church* prays, this Day, that God may grant it us. Let us Therefore Conclude; and joyn our Prayers with Her's: *O God, who by thy Blessed Martyr George's intercession & merits dost rejoyce us, mercifully grant, that we who by him crave thy Blessings, may receive them by the Gift of thy Grace, Through Iesus Christ our Lord; Amen.*

A LETTER Concerning the COVNCIL OF TRENT.

SIR,

Having peruſed the * Author you ſo much recommended to me, I am apt to fancy that never any two Hiſtorians diſagreed more than yours & mine; the one ſo zealous in exalting.

* *The Hiſtory of the Council of* Trent, *written in Italian by* Pietro Soave Polano, *tranſlated by* N.B. *printed* London. 1676. *in* fol. *pages* 769. *If my Reader have a different Edition, he may obſerve his whole number of pages, and (by the Rule of Three) as this of mine is to that, ſo will my quotations be to his.*

alting, the other in depreſſing of the Council. But yet I am not of opinion that this was the only difference bewixt them. *Pallavicini* had the freedom of the *Vatican* Archives; He referrs himſelf to the Records of the Council, & the writings of * ſuch Perſons as were Members of it. Moreover, He is ſo far from being partial, that * *Aquilino* ſays He has done the Church more diſſervice by his *Anſwer*, than his Adverſary had done by his *Hiſtory*. As for your friend *Soave*, I am afraid he's apt to make the worſt of things, even when he ſpeaks truth as to the ſubſtance. His intimate acquaintance with the Archbishop of *Spalatro*, & his correſpondency with the *French Huguenots*, are enough to make me ſuſpicious of him. If you tell me, he was a *Popiſh Frier*, I muſt mind you, that he was a *Venetian Papiſt*, that he lived in a time of great diſſentions betwixt the State of *Venice* and the Pope, & that he was even then engaged in writing againſt the Pope's proceedings. Tis hard to ſay how much he was a friend to the *Church*, But any man may ſee how bitter

* *He ſetts down their names*, l. 8. c. 10. n. 14.
* D. Still. *Rat. Account.*

ter an enemy he was to the *Court* of *Rome*. He liked well enough to be medd-ling with State-Affairs, & the Senators conſulted him as an Oracle: which unuſual honour was enough to make him proud & factious; and, whether it did or not, He only knows who ſees men's hearts. However all this put to-gether is enough to make me ſuſpect him. *Pallavicini*, you'l ſay, being of the Court-party deſerves to be ſuſpec-ted too. But, if that be all you have to ſay againſt him, we will not quarrel about preliminaries, nor looſe time in diſputing what grains of allowance are due to each of them. Upon condition you'l believe your friend *Soave* when he ſpeaks well of the Council, I am con-tent to believe *Pallavicini* whenſoever he ſpeaks ill of it.

You remember how eaſily, when I ſaw you laſt, you agreed with me, that *if the Council of* Trent *were as General, as free, and as legal in all it's circumſtances, as the firſt four Councils were, you muſt needs own your ſelf obli-ged in conſcience, to ſubmit to it, & to leave of Proteſting againſt it*. 'Twas fair & reaſonable, & what I might expect from a Son of the *Church* of *England*:

I desired no more in hand, but was willing to give credit for the rest.

I might have told you that if the Council had been only Patriarchal; it would have bound the English Reformers to the obedience of non-contradiction. Three Brittish Bishops sate in the 1. Council of *Arles*: & S. *Athanasius* in his 2. *Apol.* says that they were present in the Council of *Sardice*, which ratified the Pope's power in decision of Appeals: From whence you may conclude, that the *Brittish* Clergy were subject to the canons of *Arles* & *Sardice*, & consequently to the Western Patriarch. We find them also afterwards in the Council of *Constance*, where voting by Nations the English were one of the four in condemning these doctrines of *Huss* & *Wickliff*, that *The Pope is not the immediate Vicar of Christ*, & that *The chief Bishop of the Roman Church has no Primacy over other particular Churches.* I might have added the testimony of your own Dr. *Field*, who in his book *of the Church* freely confesses, that *The Decrees of Popes made with the consent & joynt concurrence of the other Western Bishops, do bind the Western Provinces that are subject to him as Patriarch of the West.*

But

But this is not the caſe: the Council of *Trent* is truly General; and, if the Reformers cannot manifeſtly prove the contrary, they remain without excuſe. The Objections which you ſent me in your Letter, I have conſiderd at leaſure, and, according to promiſe, have ſent you here my Anſwers: but, before I ſet them down, I muſt beg your pardon if I try your patience with ſome few remarks which follow. *Ch. Gov.* P. IV.

1. A General Council requires, either the preſence of all the Catholick Patriarchs, or their Legates, with the Biſhops of ſo many Provinces as can well convene, or their Delegates; or elſe (in their neceſſary abſence) it requires that the Acts & Decrees be approved, either by all, or by the major part of the abſent Prelates.

2. As for ſuch a General Council as comprehends all the Biſhops of the Catholick Univerſe, there never was yet any. We find always a greater or leſſer number, according to divers circumſtances; propinquity of place, peace of Princes, numeroſity of Sects, &c. The firſt four Councils, of *Nice*, *Conſtantinople*, *Epheſus*, & *Chalcedon*, by reaſon of the Oriental Hereſies, were held in the

East, & consisted principally of Oriental Bishops. In the I. were present only the Pope's two Legates, & three Western Bishops. The II. had no Western Bishop at all, but only was afterward confirm'd by the Pope & his Council. The III. had only three Delegates, sent by the Pope & his Occidental Council. They transacted most of their business, & condemn'd *Nestorius*, without the presence of the *Antiochian* Patriarch. The IV. had only four Legates sent by the Bishop of *Rome*, two *African* Bishops, & one *Sicilian*. They acted without *Dioscorus* the *Alexandrian* Patriarch. They deposed him for favouring Hereticks, & for his contumacy against the See of *Rome*.

3. If all *Catholick* Prelates, or the much greater part, be personally present in the Council, there's no need of farther acceptation to confirm it. But, this wanting, 'tis supplied by the after-acceptation of such persons as are capable of a vote, and so many as, if they had been present, would have made it the much greater part of *Catholick* Prelates, that is, of such as were not before shut out of the Church by Heresie or Schisme. The II. & V. General Councils became such by the confirmation & after-acceptation

tation of *Damaſus* & *Vigilius* with their Weſtern Bishops: and 'tis a fundamental principle of Government not ſimply Monarchicall, that No Laws can be promulgated, no Unity preſerv'd, if of their Governours the leſſer part be not regulated by the greater.

4. The Council remains General, notwithſtanding the abſence of ſome conſiderable Churches: 1. if they cannot conveniently come: 2. if they refuſe without juſt hindrance: 3. if they were formerly cut of by Hereſie or Schiſme. The Catholick Church is narrower than Chriſtianity and a Council may be General, though the Church were reduced to one Patriarchate.

5. All that were capable of a voice in any General Council, were ſummon'd to *Trent*. The Eaſtern Bishops, in the *Turks* Dominions could not conveniently come, there being war betwixt *Chriſtians* & *Turks*. The Diviſion, which occaſion'd the Aſſembly, aroſe only in the Weſt, & therefore there was leſs need of their preſence. Moreover ſix *Greek* Bishops ſate in the Council: And, ten years after, the *Wit-*

tenberg Divines ſent the *Auguſtan* Confeſſion to *Hieremy* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, whoſe Anſwer to them differs very little from the Decrees of *Trent*. Tis true; *Cyril Lucar** publish'd a Calviniſtical Confeſſion: But his immediate Succeſſor *Cyril* of *Iberia* aſſembled at *Conſtantinople* a Synod of 23. Biſhops, beſides the Patriarchs of *Alexandria* & *Hieruſalem*; And again, his Succeſſor *Parthenius* aſſembled another of 25. Biſhops, & amongſt them the Metropolitan of *Moſcovy*: Both theſe Synods anathematiz'd *Lucar* with his Adherents; and alſo juſtified theſe Tenets of the Council, the *Corporal Preſence of Chriſt's Body & Blood with the Symboles*; *Invocation of Saints*; *Veneration of ſacred Images*; *Prayer & Almes for the Faithfull deceas'd with repentance, as betterable in their preſent condition by them*; *Free will*; *ſeven Sacraments*; *Church Infallibility*, &c. See *Leo Allatius*, *De perpetuo Conſenſu* &c. l. 3. See Monſieur *Arnauld's* Answer to *Claude* l. 4 ch 7.

6. The abſence of the Proteſtant Clergy from the Council did not hinder it's being General. 1. They who are not Biſhops, have no right to ſit there. 2. When

* 1629.

When Bishops contumaciouſly abſent themſelves for fear of Cenſure, their preſence is not requiſite; otherwiſe farewell the Power of all General Councils. 3. There is no place due to them whoſe Doctrines have been anathematiz'd in former General Councils. *Veneration of Images* was declared lawfull in the II. of *Nice*. Our *Canon* of Scripture, *Purgatory*; *Seven Sacraments*, & *Pope's Supremacy*, were defined in the Council of *Florence*: Auricular *Confeſſion* & *Tranſubſtantiation*, in that of *Lateran*.

7. Although in the firſt Seſſions under *Paul* III. there were only about 48. Biſhops, 3. Benedictine Abbots, 5. Generals of Religious Orders, with about 40. able Divines by way of Counſellors: This paucity under *Paul* or *Julius* was amply recompenc'd by a greater number of Prelates under *Pius* IV who all unanimouſly receíved & ratified the former Acts of the Council. If you count them, you'l find in the Catalogue, 270. to which if you add the learned Divines who aſſiſted, the whole number amounts to about 450. perſons.

8. A General Council requires, that the Pope either preſide in it; or approve

the Acts of it, as in the caſe of the II. & V. General Council. In the IV. VI. VII. & VIII. the Proteſtants allow that he preſided. To the III. he deputed S. *Cyril*. To the I. he ſent his Legates. *Oſius*, you'l ſay, ſubſcrib'd before them. 1. Tis thought he preſided in the Pope's name with them 2. If not, it was a pure indulgence of honour to him: The Legates ſubſcribed before all the Patriarchs. 3. The ſubſcriptions were manifeſtly irregular, becauſe the Bishop of *Antioch*, who was the III. Patriarch, ſuſcribed after the Bishops of *Ægypt*, & alſo thoſe of *Paleſtine*, which were ſubject to him. I have now done with my remarks, & ſhall make what haſt I can with your objections, ſetting them down in the ſame order you ſent them.

I. The Eaſtern Biſhops were abſent: & the Proteſtants would not go to the Council. *A.* 1. There were ſix *Greek* Bishops preſent: Afterwards three Eaſtern Patriarchs, & two Aſſemblies of their Prelates approv'd the chief points. The Proteſtants had no right to a deciſive voice: Their opinions had been cenſur'd in former Councils, and were like to be condemn'd again in this: If, for theſe reaſons, they abſented; 'twas their

their own fault: The Council was never the worſe for't. 2. Read the Bulls of Convocation: you will find that *all* & *every one* who, either by *law*, by *cuſtom*, or by *priviledge*, have any right to *be preſent*, or to *deliver their opinion*, in *General Councils*, were ſummon'd to appear in *Trent*. 3. *Soave* himſelf relates how there was a deliberation of ſending, & granting ſafe-conduct, to the *Greek* Churches under the *Turk*; * *but it was preſently ſeen*, ſays he, *that theſe poor men afflicted in ſervitude, could not without danger, & aſſiſtance of money, think of Councils.* He ſays alſo, that * *although the Pope was put in mind, that to ſend Nuncio's into* England *& to Princes elſewhere, who do profeſs open Separation from the See of* Rome, *would be a diſreputation to him; yet he answer'd that he would humble himſelf to Hereſy, in regard that whatſoever was done to gain ſouls to* Chriſt, *did become that See.*

II. In ſome of the firſt Seſſions there were not above fifty Bishops. A. The difficulties & diſturbances of the Times bear all that blame. All was fully recompenc'd in the end, by a numerous

&

* p. 451. * p. 408.

& unanimous ratification of all; & by the acceptation of the abſent Prelates afterward. *Soave* ſays, that, under *Pius* IV. * *the Actions of this Council were in greater expectation than in former times, in regard the number of the Prelates were aſſembled four times as many as before.* He ſays, * *All the Decrees made in this Council, under* Paul *and* Julius, *as well of Faith as Reformation, were recited: And the Secretary going into the midſt did interrogate, whether the Fathers were pleas'd that Confirmation ſhould be demanded of Pope* Pius IV. *of all things decreed under* Paul, Julius, *& his Holineſs; and they anſwer'd, not one by one but all together*, Placet. *Pallavicini* ſays the ſame; only he proves that * the votes were given, as uſually, one by one.

III. Many of the Bishops were only Titular: And many made, during the Council, that the *Papalins* might overvote the *Ultramontans*. A. As to the firſt part; *Soave* takes notice only of two Titular Bishops, the Archbishop of *Armagh* in *Ireland*, and *Upſal* in *Sweden*; both driven from their Sees by perſecution of Proteſtants, both true Bishops by their Ordination, and both ſent by the Pope

* p. 504. * p. 757. * l. 24. c. 8.

Pope in the beginning of the Council. The ſecond part, being barely aſſerted, looks like a groundleſs calumny, & may juſtly be ſuppos'd ſuch, till ſome proof appear.

IV. The Popes, of thoſe times, & major part of the Prelates, would never allow this Title, of the Council, *Repreſenting the Univerſal Church*: Therefore they themſelves did not look upon it as a General Council. A. Here I muſt beg your pardon, if I think you very much miſtaken in your inference. This Title was uſurp'd by the Councils of *Conſtance* & *Baſil*; but never aſſum'd by any Council, which was totally approv'd. You know very well, that Catholick Divines are divided upon the point; whether the Pope be ſuperior to a General Council; or whether a General Council, without him, be ſo compleat a Repreſentati e of the Univerſal Church, as to be ſuperior to the Pope? They who maintain'd the ſuperiority of a General Council, were zealous for this Title; and the others conſtantly oppos'd it: But both parties always agreed, that the *Council* of *Trent* was as truly *General*, as the firſt four Councils were, or any have been ſince.

V. It

V. It was never receiv'd by the *Proteſtants*: Nor by the *French* Catholicks. A. 1. The Council of *Nice* was never receiv'd by the *Arians*. 2. It was univerſally receiv'd by both *Eccleſiaſtical* & *Civil* State of *France*: in point of *Doctrine*. 3. The Decrees of *Reformation* were approv'd by all the *Catholick Clergy* of that Kingdom. In the Aſſembly at *Blois*, in the year, 1576. The Archbiſhop of *Lions* in the name of all the *Eccleſiaſtical State* of *France* begg'd the *aſſiſtance* of the *King's Authority* to *put this Reformation in execution*. In the Aſſembly of *Melun*, 1579. the *Biſhop* of *Bazas*, in their name, made the ſame requeſt to the King, *chiefly becauſe they are tied & bound to all Laws, ſo made by the Catholick Church, upon pain of being reputed Schiſmatical, & of incurring the curſe of Eternal Damnation.* At *Fontainebleau* in the year, 1582. The Archbiſhop of *Bourges* tells the King, *The ſtain & reproach of Schiſm reſts upon your Kingdom amongſt other Countries. And this is the cauſe, why the Clergy doth now again moſt humbly deſire*, &c. In the General Aſſembly of the States at *Paris*, in the year, 1614. Cardinal *Perron*, & Cardinal *Richelieu*, then Biſhop

hop of *Luſon*, proſecuted in vain the ſame requeſt. Thus you ſee the *Catholick Clergy* of *France* unanimouſly receiving & approving the Council of *Trent* in matter of *Diſcipline*. The *Civil State*, as it has no share in the Votes of the Council, ſo their non-approbation cannot diminish the Authority of it. You may gueſs at the reaſons of excepting againſt it, by what the Queen Regent, *Catherine de Medicis*, was pleas'd to tell the Pope's *Nuncio*; that *the Council could not be admitted, becauſe by the Council's Decrees the King could not gratifie ſuch Miniſters of State, as had done him ſingular ſervice, with the means of Religious Houſes, & of Church-Benefices.*

VI. *Leo* X. before the Convocation of the Council, had declar'd that *Luther* & his *Adherents* were Hereticks: Being therefore already condemn'd, why should they come to Council? A. 1. Their Errors had been condemn'd in former General Councils: and, ſince it really was ſo, Why might not the Pope ſay ſo? 2. *Becauſe* the *Pope* had condemn'd them, *therefore* they * appeal'd to a *General Council*: and, ſince they had *appeal'd*

* See *Soave* p. 11.

peal'd to it, Why should they not *go* to it?

VII. It was not a legal Council. A. That is to ſay, it was not ſuch a one as they had a mind to. *Luther*, being queſtion'd, firſt made friends to be tried in *Germany*. As ſoon as he was there condemn'd by *Cajetan*, he appeal'd to the Pope. Immediatly after, foreſeeing his condemnation there, he intercepted this appeal with * another, from the Pope to a General Council; having ground to imagine, He would never call one, who was ſuppos'd, to fear that it would ſeverely reform him & his Court. As ſoon as he ſaw that, in good earneſt, a Bull was publisht, in the year, 1537. to call a Council at *Vicenza*; he began preſently, to vilifie Councils, & put out a book *De Conciliis*, to prove that they always did more harm than good; not ſparing ſo much as the firſt Councils of *Nice*, or of the *Apoſtles* Then he appeal'd from Council to *Scripture*, where He that makes himſelf ſupreme Judge of the Senſe, may eaſily maintain what abſurdity he pleaſes. *Soave* tells us, he was * *uſed to ſay, that he was ſo well aſſured of his Doctrine, that, it being Divine,*

* *ibid.* p. 8. * p. 17.

Divine, he would not ſubmit it ſo much as to the judgment of Angels; yea, that with it he was to judge all, both men & Angels. After this, his Followers thought it more plauſible not to ſhuffle ſo viſibly, but to admit a Council, & clog it with ſuch conditions as would quite diſarm it, & make it uſeleſs. You may read them in *Soave*, as follows.

* 1. *That it ſhould be celebrated in* Germany; 2. *That it ſhould not be intimated by the Pope*; 3. *That He ſhould not preſide, but be part of the Council, ſubject to the determinations of it*; 4. *That the Biſhops & other Prelates ſhould be freed from their Oath given to the Pope*; 5. *That the Holy Scripture might be Judge in Council, & all Humane Authority excluded*; 6. *That the Divines of the States of the* Auguſtan Confeſſion *ſent to the Council, might not only have a conſulting, but a deciding voice*; 7. *That the Deciſions in Council ſhould not be made, as in Secular matters, by plurality of voices; but the more ſound opinions preferr'd, that is, thoſe which were regulated by the word of God.* You will not deny, but that in *England* we have had ſome Kings whoſe

* p. 600.

whoſe title to the Crown has been unqueſtionable, & that ſome free & legal Parliaments have been aſſembled during their reign. Give me leave to put the caſe, that two or three Counties had revolted, proteſting againſt all that would be done in ſuch a Parliament, & refuſing to ſend any Deputies to it, but upon theſe conditions: 1. that it be aſſembled in their Territory; 2. that it be not call'd by the King; 3. that his Majeſty may be ſubject to it; 4. that all the members of it be freed from their Oath of Allegeance; 5. that all Humane Authority of former Parliaments may be excluded; 6. that they may depute as many as they pleaſe with a deciſive voice; 7. that (for fear of being over-voted) the Deciſions be not made, as uſually, by plurality of voices, but that the more ſound opinions, (that is, their own) may be preferr'd. What would you think of theſe Articles? Would you conclude, the Parliament was illegal, if it did not ſubmit to their demands? I do not pretend here, to make an exact parallel betwixt the *Monarchy* of the *Church* & that of *England*: yet however the parity is not ſo unequal, but

but that it may help to open your eyes.

VIII. The Parties concern'd were Judges in their own caſe. A. No more than in the I. of *Nice*. The world was then divided into Catholicks & *Arians*, as now into Catholicks & *Proteſtants*: And, as the *Catholicks* had then a right to judge the one, ſo now they had the very ſame right to judge the other. If any part ſeparate from the whole, it does not therefore acquire a right of ſaying, that the Whole, from which they divide themſelves, is now a Party, & therefore muſt not judge them. Pope *Leo* and *Dioſcorus* Bishop of *Alexandria* counteraccus'd one another of Hereſy; and yet the Pope legally preſided in the IV. General Council which condemn'd *Dioſcorus*. Neither was it ever thought a ſufficient excuſe for *Dioſcorus* to ſay, the Pope was a Party & Judge in his own caſe.

Mr: *Chillingworth* confeſſes, that, in controverſies of Religion, *it is in a manner impoſſible to avoid but the Judge muſt be a Party. For this muſt be the firſt controverſy, whether he be a Judge or no; and in that he muſt be a Party*. Such is the Pope's Caſe, in the Definition of his Supremacy. The ſame neceſſi-

neceſſity is found in ſupreme *Civil* power. Inferiour Courts are liable to Appeals: But, if ſome of the King's ſubjects rebell againſt him, & oppoſe his prerogatives or laws; 'tis evidently neceſſary that the King muſt judge his own caſe, or the Offence muſt not be judg'd at all. What muſt the King do? Subſtitute an equal number of Royaliſts & Rebells? This can never be an effectual proviſion for the Common Peace of Government. Or muſt he remit the arbitration to a neighbouring State? 1. This ſtate is always intereſs'd; & therefore partial. 2. This does not leave, within the compaſs of any Kingdom upon earth, ſufficient power to procure the common good. 3. Were it allow'd in *Civil* Power, it cannot be applied to our preſent caſe, unleſs Controverſies in Religion could be decided out of the Church, by men of no Religion at all.

In the National Synod of *Dort*, in the year, 1618. the Low-country *Remonſtrants* ſeeing themſelves like to be over-voted by the *Proteſtants*, made the ſame excuſes; ſaying, that the major part of the Synod was declar'd of a contrary party; that they were already excom-

excommunicated by them; and, therefore, they ought not to be Judges. To this, the Synod replied: that, if this exception were admitted, it would ſubvert the whole frame of Eccleſiaſtical Government: that Paſtors would be diſcourag'd from their duty of oppoſing the firſt beginnings of Hereſy, if therefore they muſt forfeit their right of giving ſuffrages, or being Judges, afterwards: that the *Arians* & *other Hereticks* might ever have pleaded the ſame exception againſt the Orthodox Fathers: that Divines neither are, nor ought to be, indifferent in matters of Religion; ſo that, if only Neuters may be judges, there will be none left in the Church, and we muſt go abroad (no body knows where) to look for 'em. This was the ſubſtance of their Anſwer; which I here ſet down in the Latin, to ſatisfie your curioſity. *Nunquam praxim hanc Eccleſiarum fuiſſe, ut Paſtores, quoties exorientibus erroribus ex officio ſe opponerent, propterea jure ſuffragiorum, aut de illis ipſis erroribus judicandi poteſtate, exciderent. Ita enim omnem everti judiciorum Eccleſiaſticorum ordinem; efficique ne Paſtores officio ſuo fideliter fungi queant.... Eos qui in doctrinâ*

ctrinâ aut moribus ſcandalorum autores ſunt, ſemper Cenſores ſuos, Conſiſtoria, Claſſes, Synodos, ceu partem adverſam, rejicere .... ad eum modum Arianis, aliiſque olim hereticis, adverſus Orthodoxos Paſtores ſemper licuiſſet excipere. The *Engliſh* Divines deliver'd their opinion in theſe terms: 1. *Huic ſententiæ refragatur perpetua praxis omnium Eccleſiarum. Nam in Synodis Oecumenicis, Nicæno, &c. ii, qui antiquitus receptam doctrinam oppugnarunt, ab illis, qui eandem ſibi traditam admiſerunt & approbarunt, examinati, judicati, damnati ſunt.* 2. *Ipſius rei neceſſitas huc cogit. Theologi enim, in negotio religionis, neque eſſe ſolent tanquam abraſa tabula, neque eſſe debent. Si igitur ſoli neutrales poſſent eſſe judices, extra Eccleſiam in quâ lites enatæ ſunt, quærendi eſſent.* 3. *Ipſa æquitas ſuadere videtur. Nam qua ratio reddi poteſt, ut ſuffragiorum jure priventur omnes illi Paſtores, qui ex officio receptam Eccleſiæ Doctrinam propugnantes ſecus docentibus adverſati ſunt. Si hoc obtinuerit, nova dogmata ſpargentibus nemo obſiſteret, ne ipſo facto jus omne poſtmodum de illis controverſiis judicandi amitteret.* Pray, give me leave now to ask, Why might not the Parties

Parties be Judges in the Council of *Trent*, as well as in the Synod of *Dort*? If, in one caſe, the *Remonſtrants* were oblig'd to ſubmit to the *Proteſtants*, Why were not the *Proteſtants* oblig'd to ſubmit to the *Catholicks* in the other? The Synod was forc'd to pretend ſome diſparity; and, for want of a better, alledg'd this; that the *Proteſtants* and *Remonſtrants* were under the *ſame Magiſtracy*. And, what if if they were? We are not now talking of *Civil* Aſſemblies, but of *Eccleſiaſtical*. Dos the diviſion of *Civil* Power deſtroy the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church*, which we believe in our *Creed*? Or, if there be any reaſon why (when any Schiſme ariſes) the *Authority* of the *Whole* is devolved to the *major part*, does not the ſame Reaſon conclude as evidently in favour of a *General*, as of a *National*, Council?

IX. To make it better appear, which was the *major part*, the Proteſtants ought to have had a deciſive voice in Council. A. 1. *Binius* ſays, that the Council premitted this caution; that, if the Proteſtants were allow'd, for once, to give a *Placet*, it ſhould be no prejudice to the right & honour of

the preſent & future Councils: which looks as if the Council were not fully reſolv'd to deny this to them, if much inſiſted upon. 2. They, who openly maintain ſuch doctrines as have been formerly condemn'd in General Councils, are cutt of from the Catholick Church; they are not Members of it; & therefore can have no right to a deciſive voice. 3. If it had been permitted, they were ſtill certain to be over-voted by 270. Bishops; to whom if you add the Catholick Divines, by the ſame rule as the Proteſtants, there remain'd no ground for any hopes. This the Proteſtants ſaw well enough, & therefore were willing to wave all *Eccleſiaſtical* Judges. *Soave* tells you, how they ſhuffled in this point. One time, they propoſed a Deciſion by *Laicks* indifferently choſen, in an equal number, on both ſides. Another time, they appeal'd to * *a godly & free Council*, which *is not the Tribunal of Pope & Prieſts only, but of all the Orders of the Church, not excluding the Seculars.* Here indeed the *Clergy* were admitted to this *godly & free Council*; but it was only, by way of ſpectators, to ſee what the

* p. 73.

the *Laity* would pleaſe to do there: for, * *the Pope making himſelf a party to the cauſe, it* was *juſt that the manner and form of the proceeding, ſhould be determin'd by the Princes.* This was the * *Anſwer of* 15. *Princes, &* 30. *Cities, aſſembled in* Smalcalda, 1535. Again, about two years after, when the * *Emperour ſent his Vice-Chancellor to exhort them to receive the Council*, they anſwerd, that *they* had *always demanded a free & Chriſtian Council, that every man may freely ſpeak, Turks & Infidels being excluded.* Here you ſee, that every man, who call'd himſelf a Chriſtian, (no matter how otherwiſe qualified) was to have a free Vote in Council: only Turks & Infidels were to be excluded. Judge you, what a *free* & *godly* Council this was like to be. Mean time, all this was only a copy of their countenance. They clearly foreſaw that the much greater part, of thoſe to whom God has committed the care of his Church, would certainly condemn their errors: They were already ſelf-condemn'd, as to Authority; And therefore they never intended to appear in any legal Council, but hated the very thought of it: Al-

* ibid. * ib. * p. 76.

though the Name of a Council was very plauſible, and fit to be made uſe of, for a time, to amuſe the world with an opinion of the Reformers, that they were not proud & obſtinate; but always willing to hear reaſon, & deſirous to be better informed.

The Duke of *Pruſſia* was more ſincere, when *Canobius* came to invite him; He * *anſwer'd* plainly, without any mincing or diſguiſing of the matter, *that he was of the* Auguſtan *Confeſſion*, & therefore *could not conſent to a Popish Council.* Yet, after all, to do the Proteſtants juſtice, I muſt needs confeſs that, as ſoon as they were no longer in fear of the Emperour, they began to unmask & ſpeak as plainly as the Duke did. Read *Soave's* Annals, 1562. he ſays that, * *ſo ſoon as the Diet was aſſembled in* Francfort, *the Prince of* Condé *ſent to treat an union of the* Huguenots *with thoſe of the Confeſſion of* Ausburg; *and, in particular, to make a joynt demand, for a free & new Council, in which the reſolutions of* Trent *might be examin'd, the* French *men of the old Catholick Religion giving hope alſo that they would agree unto it . . . But the* Dutch

* p. 413. * p. 599.

Dutch *Proteſtants were moſt averſe from a Council, ſo long as* Germany *might be in peace without it. And therefore a book was printed in* Francfort, *full of reaſons why they neither would, nor could, come to* Trent, *with proteſtation of the nullity of all that was, or would be, done in that place.*

One thing, which makes me leſs wonder they could never agree to any Council of ours, is this, that I find in *Soave*, they could not agree in a Council of their own. * In *Germany*, ſays he, *the Princes of the* Auguſtan *Confeſſion, aſſembled in* Neumburg, *being aſhamed that their Religion ſhould be eſteem'd a Confuſion for the variety of Doctrines amongſt them, did propoſe that they might firſt agree in one, & then reſolve whether they ought to refuſe or accept the Synod... They ſaid, the* Auguſtan *Confeſſion was to be the ground of their Doctrine; but, there being divers copies of that Confeſſion, which differ'd, in regard of divers additions made in divers of them, ſome approving one & ſome another, Many thought they ought to take that only which was preſented to* Charles *in the year*, 1530. *Whereunto thoſe*

* p. 411.

of the Palatinate *did not consent, unless it were declared, in a Proheme made unto it, that the other Edition did agree with it. The Duke of* Saxony *answer'd, that they could not stop the eyes & ears of the world, that they should not see & hear their differences; & that if they would make shew of union, where they were at variance, they should be convinc'd of vanity & lying: And, after many contentions, they remain'd without agreement in that point.* How should the Catholicks please them, if they knew not how to please themselves?

X. The burning of *John Huss* was a sufficient excuse for the Protestants, not to rely upon any Safe conduct. A. I must beg your pardon, if I believe no such matter. It was no excuse at all. His Safe conduct was of the *ordinary* form; Theirs was *extraordinary*: And, therefore the Case was quite different.

'Tis certain that the *Ordinary* Safe-conducts secure a man only from *unjust violence*, but not from the *just execution of a legal sentence*, if he be found guilty. When a person, suspected of a crime, is cited to appear, & to answer for himself, the *Ordinary* Safe-conduct secures him from all abuses or affronts which might

might otherwiſe be offer'd to him, either going, ſtaying, or returning: but however, if, after a fair Trial, he be legally condemn'd: it will never ſave him from ſuffering according to Law. If this were all the Security that *Huſs* relied upon, we may juſtly admire his confidence, in going ſo boldly to the Council; but cannot reaſonably wonder, either at his impriſonment, or execution.

That this was all the Security given him, appears by the teſtimony of one of his own Diſciples, who wrote his *Acts* which are publiſh'd in the beginning of his Works, & ſays he was an eyewitneſs of what paſs'd. He relates the words of the Emperour *Sigiſmond* telling *Huſs* to his face, at *Conſtance*; * *Although*, ſays he, *Some ſay that, by your friends & patrons, you receiv'd our Letters of Publick Faith, fifteen days after your impriſonment; yet we can prove, by the teſtimony of many Princes & men of chief note, that, before you left* Prague, *you receiv'd our Letters by* Wenceſlaus *of* Duba, *&* John *of* Chlum, *to whoſe truſty care we recommended you, THAT NO INJURY MIGHT BE DONE TO YOU, but that you might ſpeak freely,*

* *Acta Iohannis Huſs.* p. 15.

& answer for your self, before the whole Council, concerning your faith & doctrine. And this, you see, the most Reverend Lords, Cardinals & Bishops, have so perform'd, that I have reason to give them many thanks... Now therefore we advise you, not to defend any thing obstinately, but to submit your self, with what obedience you ought, to the Authority of the Holy Council. If you do this, we will endeavour, that, for our sakes, you may be favourably dismiss'd by the Council. If not... We truly will never patronize your obstinacy & your errors.

In this discourse of the Emperour I observe, 1. That the *Letters of Publick Faith* were given to *Huss*, only *that no injury might be done to* him: And therefore conclude, that, if contrary to the common law of Safe-conducts he endeavour'd to make his escape, his imprisonment was just, and no injury done. See *Bremus* a Protestant Lawyer, *Quæst. ult. de Securitate*, who cites a great number of others, agreeing with him in this opinion, that *Publick Faith is ended or forfeited, if a man, having receiv'd Publick Faith, committs a new crime, because, for this, he may be punish'd.* 2. That the friends of *Huss* made no great scruple

ſcruple of telling ſtories in favour of him, & of raiſing a falſe report that the *Letters* were given him the fifteenth day after his confinement; thinking, perhaps, that by this rumour the Emperour would be oblig'd in honour, to reſcue him out of priſon: Which deceitful dealing makes me leſs wonder, either that his Diſciples make no mention of his endeavouring to eſcape, or that the Nobles of *Bohemia*, take no notice of it in their Letters of complaint to the Emperour; & makes me more apt to believe the Relation of it, ſet down by *Ulricus Reichental*, an inhabitant of *Conſtance*, an eye-witneſs of what happened, & an accurate Hiſtorian of the Council, whom if you underſtand not in the original *Teutonick*, you may read this part tranſlated into *Latin* by *Cochlaus*, lib. 11. *Hiſt. Huſſitarum*, pag. 73.

Before *Huſs* was guilty of this crime, he had been *kindly receiv'd* and *favourably treated* at *Conſtance*, as well as all the way thither. This he confeſſes himſelf, in his Letters to his friends. * *We came*, ſays he, *to* Conſtance, *after the feaſt of All Saints, paſſing through the*

* *Epiſt.* 5.

Cities without any ill usage. And we lodge in a street which is nigh the Pope's Palace. Again; * *All my affairs are in a good posture*, says he; *Scitote quod bene sto per omnia.* And, in his Letter above cited, speaking of *Latzembock* and *Lepka* to whose care the Emperour had recommended him, he says, * *They have been with the Pope, & have spoken to him concerning me; Who answer'd, that he will do nothing by violence.* Besides, his Chamber-fellow *Plebanus de Jannowitz* wrote a Letter dated from *Constance*, the Saturday before S *Martin*'s feast; in which he tells, how * *the Bishop of* Constance *with his Official, came to their Lodging, letting them know that the Pope suspended the interdict & the sentences of excommunication against Master* John; *desiring him nevertheless, that, to avoid scandal & discourse of the People, he would absent himself from the solemn services of the Mass; otherwise, that he might freely go about to see the Town, the Churches, or any other places, as he pleased.. We have*, says he, *full liberty in* Constance.

Afterwards, as *Ulricus* relates it, *the people*

* *Ep.* 6. * *Ep.* 5. * *Ep.* 4. *Hussiticarum.*

people flock'd together, to hear Huſs *ſay Maſs in his Lodging*; which being a ſcandalous thing, (he having been excommunicated for Hereſy, & not having yet juſtified himſelf) *the Bishop of* Conſtance, *as Ordinary of the place, prohibited* his doing ſo: But, *Huſs* ſtill perſiſting *to celebrate, & the Bishop forbidding the people to be preſent*, he began to look upon it as an evil *omen* of his future condemnation, and reſolv'd to contrive his eſcape. *Upon the third Sunday in Lent, when* Huſs *did not appear at dinner*, Latzembock *went immediatly to the Governour of the City, and complain'd of the flight of* John Huſs. *The gates being shut*, & ſearch made, *Huſs* was *found hid in a Cart* of the ſame *Latzembock*, where he lay cover'd *with hay & ſtraw*, which had been order'd to be tranſported out of town, that afternoon. *Latzembock* made *him* be *ſet on horſe back, & brought him to the Pope's Palace. He pleaded, that, having Safe-conduct, he ought not to be impriſon'd.* But this Noble *Bohemian* (who knew very well what Safe-conduct he had, he being committed to his care, by *Sigiſmond*) anſwer'd, *'Tis ſo Decreed, that either you muſt juſtifie your Cauſe,*

that it is not heretical; or die, unleſs you renounce it. I do not ſay, this was not ſevere; The Imperial Laws are ſevere enough: but yet, ſince it was according to the Common Law of *Ordinary* Safe-conducts, it cannot be truly call'd an *Injury*. And, by the ſame rule, that the Emperour was not oblig'd, according to his Letters, *to patronize his obſtinacy & his errors*, neither was he oblig'd to protect him from the courſe of Common Law in this occaſion.

Nevertheleſs I am apt to believe, that the Emperour did really deſign to procure (as much as he could, by fair means) more favour for him than the rigour of the Law allow'd. Among other reaſons which incline me to this opinion, theſe two may ſuffice at preſent: 1. that *John Chlum* * complain'd, his Maſter's Safe-conduct was violated: 2. that the Emperour himſelf in his Anſwer to the Nobles of *Bohemia*, writes, He * *often ſollicited for him; often, in a paſſion, went out of the Council; yea rather, upon his account, departed from* Conſtance; *till they ſaid*, If You will not

* *Inter Epiſt. Huſſiticas.* num. 57. * *Cochlaus* l. 4. *Hiſt. Huſſitarum.* p. 155.

not give Juſtice leave to take its courſe in Council, what have We to do here? *Whereupon*, ſays he, *I concluded, it was not in my power to do any thing more, in this matter. Neither was it lawfull for me to ſpeak any more, of this Buſineſs; becauſe, by ſo doing, the Council would have been diſſolv'd.* Thus He behaved himſelf; And, whether it were Vanity, or Generoſity, or Policy, that moved him, is not my buſineſs to enquire; Tis enough for your ſatisfaction & mine, that, by his *Letters of Publick Faith*, He was not oblig'd, either in Conſcience, or in Honour, to reſcue him out of the hands of *Juſtice*, but only to protect him from *Unjuſt Violence*.

Tis incredible, you'l ſay, that *Huſs* ſhould be ſuch a fool as to go to *Conſtance* upon theſe terms. Neither can I deny but that it muſt be ſome degree of folly for any man to be ſo confident of his own abilities as to cope with a whole Council, & to defie all his Oppoſers to convince him of his errors. But why might not the Maſter be as bold as the Scholar? I mean *Jerome* of *Prague* who follow'd him ſoon after, to *Conſtance*, upon the ſame terms, with a Safe-conduct from the Council. * *Citamus* ...

* *Seſſ.* 6. *quatenus*

quatenus compareas . . . recepturus, ac facturus, in omnibus Juſtitiæ complementum, ad quod A VIOLENTIA, JUSTITIA SEMPER SALVA, omnem Salvum-conductum noſtrum, quantum in nobis eſt, & Fides exigit Orthodoxa, præſentium tenore offerimus. Obſerve theſe words, *a violentiâ*; The Safe-conduct was only to ſecure him from unjuſt *violence*. Obſerve alſo the following clauſe, *Juſtitiâ ſemper ſalvâ*; He was not to expect any protection againſt *Juſtice*. If *Jerome* deſired no more than this from the Council, Why might not *Huſs* be content with as much from the Emperour?

That this was the *Ordinary form* of all Safe-conducts, granted according to Common Law, appears evidently by the general conſent of Lawyers; among which, for your better ſatisfaction, I ſhall cite only ſuch as were Proteſtants. *Bremus*, q. 7. *de Securitate*, ſays, this is the common Imperial form of Safe-conducts; *Damus tibi Fidem Publicam, cauſam dicendi in Judicio, CONTRA VIM, NON CONTRA JURIS EXECUTIONEM.* *Mynſingerus*, Obſerv. 82. upon the Judgment of the Imperial Chamber, ſays, *Quando datur alicui*

alicui Securitas, vel Salvus conductus; Tunc intelligitur ſolum de VIOLENTIA, quæ de facto CONTRA JUS infertur. Et ideo, meo tempore, cuidam, qui habebat Salvum-conductum, capto propter delictum, vel maleficium, & ſupplicanti in Cameræ pro Mandato de relaxando... petiit Proceſſus a Dominis Aſſeſſoribus ſunt denegati. Again, *Everardus Specklan.* another Lawyer, *Centuriâ* 1. q. 1, §. 18. cites a great many Authors, All agreeing that ſuch is the uſual form. And, in the *Jus Camerale*, Tit. 276. (See the Edition of *Goldaſtus*) this Law of *Maximilianus Auguſtus* is read; *Subditos Judicio Rotwilenſi avocaturi, Fidem actori Publicam, CONTRA VIM, NON CONTRA JUS, dare tenentor.* Any man, that underſtands *Latin*, ſees plainly by theſe quotations, that *Common Law*, in ſuch Caſes, always grants *Security* from *Injury*, but not from *Juſtice*.

That *Huſs* had no Safe-conduct from the *Pope*, he expreſſely acknowledges, *Epiſt.* 6. *I came*, ſays he, *to* Conſtance, *without Safe conduct from the Pope.* That he had none from the *Council*, appears not only by his ſilence, but by *Soave*'s Hiſtory, *pages*, 298. & 307.

which

which I shall cite in the following Objection. That the Safe-conduct, which he had from the *Emperour*, was never intended to hinder the Council's proceeding againſt him, according to the Canons, is manifeſt, not only by what has been already ſaid, but by the Emperour's *Letters of Publick Faith*, dated from *Spire*, Octob. 18. 1414. extant in *Goldaſtus* his *Appendix Documentorum ad Commentarios de Regni Bohemiæ Juribus & Privilegiis.* p. 81. *We heartily recommend, to all & every one of you, the honourable Maſter* John Huſs *Batchelor of Divinity, & Maſter of Arts, the Bearer of Theſe, whom We have taken into Our protection & Safeguard of the Holy Empire, paſſing from the Kingdom of* Bohemia *to the General Council which is ſhortly to be held in the City of* Conſtance: *Deſiring you to receive him kindly, & treat him favourably, whenſoever he ſhall come unto you, and that you will & ought to ſhew your readineſs, in promoting what belongs to his ſpeed & ſafety, either by Land or Water, permitting alſo, him, his ſervants, his horſes, & all things elſe belonging to him, freely, & without any hindrance, to paſſe, to ſtop, to ſtay, & to return,*

return, by any paſſages, ports, bridges, lands, dominions, juriſdictions, cities, towns, caſtles, villages, & whatſoever places of yours, without any expence of tribute, toll, or any other payment; And, that you will, & ought, for the honour & reſpect of our Majeſty, to provide Secure & Safe conduct for him & his, when occaſion ſhall require.

All this the Emperour commanded, as much as lay in Him, And, in all this, his ſubjects obeyd, as much as lay in them. He had no Authority over the Council, in matters of Religion: Nor do I find the leaſt ſyllable of any promiſe, made by the Emperour to him, that the Council ſhould not proceed againſt him, according to Law. He came upon his good behaviour, and in his own defence; confiding in his own prudence and abilities, as well as in the Emperour's Letters; in which there is no ſign of theſe two promiſes, 1. that he ſhould not be impriſon'd, if by any miſdemeanour he deſerv'd it; 2. that he ſhould not be executed, if legally condemn'd.

Both theſe promiſes were plainly included in the *Extraordinary* Safe-conduct which the *Tridentine* Council granted to the *Proteſtants*: And therefore,

fore, as I told you in the beginning, The Caſe was quite different. Read *Soave*, and if you believe him, you'l begin to be asham'd of your objection. * *The Synod doth make Faith to all Prieſts, Princes, & Perſons of what condition ſoever... Safe conduct, to come, remain, PROPOSE, & ſpeak IN THE SYNOD, to HANDLE & EXAMINE WHAT THEY THINK FIT, give Articles, & confirm them, ANSWER the OBJECTIONS of the Council, & DISPUTE with thoſe, whom it doth elect, declaring that the CONTROVERSIES in this Council ſhall be handled according to the HOLY SCRIPTURE, Traditions of the APOSTLES, approv'd COUNCILS, Conſent of the CATHOLICK CHURCH, & Authority of the Holy FATHERS; adding, that they SHALL NOT BE PUNISH'D upon PRETENCE OF RELIGION, or OFFENCES COMITTED, or which WILL BE COMMITTED... and ſhall RETURN, when it ſhall ſeem good unto them, WITHOUT LET, with SAFETY OF THEIR ROBE, HONOUR, & PERSONS, but with the knowledg of the Deputies of the Synod, that proviſion*

* p. 348, Conc. Trid Seſſ. 15. & 18.

proviſion may be made for their Security: granting that, in this Safe conduct, ALL theſe CLAUSES be held to be included, which are NECESSARY FOR REAL & FULL ASSURANCE: Adding, that if any of the Proteſtants, *either in coming, or in Trent, or in returning, SHALL COMMIT ANY ENORMITY, which ſhall NULLIFIE THE BENEFIT OF THIS PUBLICK FAITH, he ſhall be PUNISH'D BY THEIR OWN* Proteſtant *JUDGES, ſo that the Synod may be ſatisfied: and, on the other ſide, if any* Catholick *in coming hither, remaining here, or returning, SHALL COMMIT ANY THING which may VIOLATE THIS SAFE CONDUCT, he ſhall be puniſh'd by the Synod, WITH APPROBATION OF THE GERMAN* Proteſtant's *THEMSELVES, who ſhall be preſent in Trent.... which things it promiſeth faithfully, in the name of all faithfull Chriſtians, Eccleſiaſtical & Secular.* If *Huſs* & *Jerome* had come to *Conſtance* with ſuch a Safe-conduct, they had neither been impriſon'd, nor executed. With ſuch a one as this, the *Bohemians* went afterwards to *Baſil*, were civilly uſed, & return'd

return'd quietly home. With this the *Wittenberg* Proteſtants went to *Trent*, remain'd quiet there, & return'd without receiving any affront. That no more of the Proteſtants follow'd their example, in going thither, was their own fault: They knew very well, they might have gone, remain'd, & return'd, ſecurely, if they pleas'd. Conſider all this, at leiſure; and then, tell me (if you can) what's become of your Excuſe.

XI. The Councils of *Conſtance* & *Sienna* had declared it lawfull to break the faith of any Safe-conduct whatſoever. A. Read the Decrees; you'l plainly ſee the contrary. The Council of *Conſtance* dos not ſay, 'tis lawfull for any, whoſoever they are, to violate the faith of their promiſes; but only declares, that no *Secular* Power can legally hinder the exerciſe of *Eccleſiaſtical* Juriſdiction, becauſe it is, not only independent of it, but manifeſtly ſuperior to it, in matters of Religion. Tis a common Maxim of the Law; *Superior legibus aut pactis Inferioris non ligatur.* And, in all appearance, the deſign of the Council was to ſatisfie the World, that, although the

Emperour

Emperour had pretended to grant an *Extraordinary* Safe-conduct, ſuch as exempts a man from *Juſtice* as well as *Violence*, it could not have hindred the ſupreme Power of Pope & Council from proceeding according to the Canons, in Cauſes which are purely of Religion.

This was the reaſon why the Proteſtants would not rely upon the Emperour's Safe-conduct; Nor can I blame them for it. See *Soave*, p. 298. *Duke* Maurice *wrote to the Emperour, that his Safe-conduct was not ſufficient. For, in the Council of* Conſtance, *it was determin'd, that* THEY MIGHT PROCEED AGAINST THOSE THAT CAME TO THE COUNCIL, THOUGH THEY HAD SAFE-CONDUCT FROM THE EMPEROUR. And that, therefore *the* Bohemians *would not go* Baſil, *but under the Publick Faith of the whole Council.* See p. 307. The Ambaſſadors *went all together to the Preſidents*, & told them, that *the Emperour had given* the Proteſtants *a Safe-conduct, but that they were not contented with it, alledging that it was decreed in the Council of* Conſtance, *and really executed, that* THE COUNCIL

IS

IS NOT BOUND BY THE SAFE-CONDUCT OF ANY, WHOSOEVER HE BE; & therefore they required one from the Synod. Theſe Proteſtants, you ſee, underſtood the Council in the ſame ſenſe as I do: How come you to underſtand it otherwiſe?

Let the *Decree* ſpeak for it ſelf, & judge the caſe berwixt us. It runs thus: *Preſens Sancta Synodus, ex QUOVIS SALVO CONDUCTU per Imperatorem, Reges, & alios Seculi Principes, HÆRETICIS vel de Hæreſi diffamatis, putantes eoſdem ſic a ſuis erroribus revocare, quocunque vinculo ſe adſtrinxerint, CONCESSO, NULLUM Fidei Catholicæ, vel JURISDICTIONI ECCLESIASTICÆ, præjudicium generari, vel IMPEDIMENTUM PRÆSTARI POSSE ſeu DEBERE declarat, QUOMINUS dicto Salvo conductu non obſtante, LICEAT JUDICI competenti & ECCLESIASTICO de hujuſmodi perſonarum erroribus INQUIRERE, & aliàs contra eos DEBITE PROCEDERE, eoſdemque PUNIRE, QUANTUM JUSTITIA SUADEBIT, ſi ſuos errores revocare pertinaciter recuſaverint, etiamſi de Salvo conductu confiſi ad locum venerint Judicii, aliàs non venturi:*

venturi: Nec ſic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipſo eſt, ex hoc in aliquo remanſiſſe obligatum. Conc. Conſt. *Seſſ.* 17.

The Council does not ſay, that any one, who makes a promiſe, is not obliged in conſcience to keep it, to the utmoſt of his juſt & lawfull power: But only declares, that every man's Promiſes, & Obligations of performance, are confined within the limits of his own Juriſdiction, which he cannot lawfully exceed; And that, therefore, No man either can promiſe, or be by promiſe oblig'd to perform, any more. This is the plain ſenſe of thoſe words: *Nec ipſum promittentem* Imperatorem, Regem, vel alium quemvis Seculi Principem. *cum fecerit quod in ipſo eſt*, quod nimirum, ex officio, & jure ſuo, poteſt ac debet, *ex hoc* Salvo conductu, *in aliquo*, quod Juriſdictioni obſit Eccleſiaſticæ, *remanſiſſe* ulteriùs *obligatum.* Can you blame this Doctrine? Does not every body know, 1. that any man *may* promiſe, & every man *ought* to perform, what lies in his power? 2. that no man can, either promiſe to encroach upon a power ſuperior to his own, or be oblig'd to perform it?

The

The 1. *Act* of the Council of *Sienna* proceeds upon the ſame principles. Though it was very inconſiderable in its iſſue & concluſion, it was General in its convocation & deſign; It imitated the Council of *Conſtance*, in aſſuming the Title of *Repreſenting the Univerſal Church*; And, by vertue of the ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Power implied in that Title, They commanded All Governours Eccleſiaſtical & Secular, to proſecute the Laws againſt the followers of *Huſs* & *Wickliff*, revoking & forbidding all *priviledges, immunities, exemptions, & Safe-conducts* whatſoever; *Privilegiis, Exemptionibus, Immunitatibus, SALVIS CONDUCTIBUS, a quibuſcumque Perſonis, Eccleſiaſticis vel Secularibus, etiamſi Pontificali, Imperiali, Regali, aut Ducali; aut aliâ quâcumque Eccleſiaſticâ vel Seculari præfulgeant dignitate, conceſſis vel concedendis, NON OBSTANTIBUS QUIBUSCUNQUE.* You may look upon this Perſecuting Decree as a ſevere thing, & blame it (if you pleaſe) upon that account: But you cannot juſtly blame the Doctrine upon which 'tis grounded, it being the very ſame with that of the Council of *Conſtance*.

If

If you ask me, Why then dos the Council of *Trent* inſert this clauſe in the end of the Safe-conduct, that * *the Synod ſhall not uſe, or ſuffer any to uſe, any authority, power, right, ſtatute, or priviledg, of laws, canons, or Councils, ESPECIALLY that of* Conſtance, *& of* Sienna; *which things, in this behalf, & for this time, the Council doth diſallow?* Why dos it *diſallow* theſe Statutes, if they were fair & juſt? A. It dos not diſallow them *abſolutely*, but only *conditionally*; that is, *IF* they contain any doctrine contrary to the Security of Publick Faith. The reaſon of this proceeding was, becauſe among the Proteſtants there were a great many who had an ill opinion of theſe Decrees, and were very jealous of them. 'Twas more eaſy for the Council to proteſt, that, whatſoever they were, they ſhould not prejudice the Safe-conduct; than it was, to perſwade them that the Decrees were innocent. It was the charitable deſign of the Council to uſe all condeſcenſion poſſible, and give ſuch an *extraordinary* Safe-conduct, as might prevent all jealouſies & take away all excuſes. And here it is, that the Synod might juſtly

* p 348.

ſay, what the Pope ſaid upon an other occaſion, They * *humbled themſelves to Hereſy, in regard that whatſoever was done to gain ſouls to Chriſt, did become that* Council.

If you have a mind to ſee a great deal more of this charitable condeſcenſion towards them, read *Soave's* Hiſtory, where he tells you how, the Council having granted them a Safe-conduct in the 13. Seſſion, they excepted againſt it, & demanded another of a more ample form, which was ſoon after granted, & publish'd in the 15. Seſſion, *Jan.* 25. 1552. Obſerve how *Soave* relates it. * *The Emperour's Ambaſſadors deſired to have the draught of* it, *before it was publish'd, to ſhew it the Proteſtants, that if it did not give them ſatisfaction, it might be ſo amended, that they might not have an occaſion to refuſe it, as they did the other.* Afterwards *the Emperour's Ambaſſadors call'd the Proteſtants to them, & the Ambaſſador* Pictavius *exhorted them to give ſome little part of ſatisfaction to the Council, as they receiv'd much from it; told them that it was concluded, to receive*

* p. 408. * p. 343.

receive their Mandates & Perſons, and to hear their Propoſitions, and to defer the concluſion of the points of Doctrine, though already diſcuſs'd & digeſted, to expect the Divines, and hear them firſt; that they have a very ample Safe-conduct, as they deſired . . . that it was neceſſary to yield ſomething to the time, & not to deſire all at once; that when they ſhall be entred into the buſineſs, occaſion will make them obtain many things which before ſeem'd hard . . . that they themſelves, the Emperour's Ambaſſadors, have matters to propoſe of great moment, and do ſtand only expecting that the Proteſtants ſhould begin, that afterwards they themſelves may come forth alſo. For this cauſe he prayed them to proceed ſlowly in their demand, that the Pope ſhould ſubmit himſelf to the Council. For the Fathers do know that there is ſomething to be amended in the Papal greatneſs; but withall, that they muſt go on cunningly; that they themſelves have dayly experience, what dexterity & art muſt be uſed in treating with the Pope's Miniſters. Therefore let their Divines come, who ſhould have a convenient

audience in all things, and when they shall ſee themſelves wrong'd, it shall ever be free for them to depart. The Proteſtants retiring & conſidering the draught of the Safe-conduct, were not content. They required four things more; 1. a deciſive voice; 2. that the Scripture, & interpreters conformable to it, should be Judges; 3. that they might exerciſe their religion in their own houſes; 4. that nothing should be done in contempt of their doctrine. * *The Imperialiſts perſwaded them to go on with dexterity; ſaying, as before, that with time they should obtain all; but, ſeeking things diſtaſtfull, & before there was opportunity, every thing would be more hard*: that the 3. article *was underſtood to be granted, becauſe it was not forbid*: & that the 4. *was plainly expreſs'd, becauſe good uſage was promis'd.* Ambaſſador *Toledo* had told them, * *that the chief importance was in the Security of coming & departing; that the reſidue appertain'd to the manner of their Negotiation, which might more eaſily be concluded by the preſence of the Divines, that it was too much obſtinacy, to yield in nothing, & to deſire to give laws*

* p. 349. * p. 344.

laws to the whole Church. After all this, * *the Proteſtants receiv'd the Safe-conduct; but, with proteſtation, that they did it, only to ſend it to their Princes.* Would not any body think, theſe men were very hard to pleaſe?

XII. When ſome of the Proteſtants came to *Trent.* they were denied audience, & liberty of diſputing. A. Neither the one, nor the other, was denied them. Tis true, they were not heard: but whoſe fault was that? It was becauſe the victorious Army of the Proteſtants made the Bishops run away from *Trent*, before the preliminaries of the Treaty could be well agreed upon. They came about the middle of *March*, & departed in the beginning of *April*. Have but a little patience to hear *Soave* tell the ſtory, and you will preſently ſee that this objection is a meer calumny. * *The Electors of* Mentz *and* Collen *departed the eleventh of* March.... *four Divines of* Wittenberg *and two of* Argentina *came to* Trent *afterwards*, & deſired *to begin the Conference. The Legat anſwer'd, that the nineteenth of* March *being a day appointed for the Seſſion*, they would then conſider about

* p. 352. * ibid.

a form how to treat. Was this, denying audience? Afterwards a *reſolution* was *taken, to prolong the Seſſion till the firſt of* May. This was ſome Delay indeed, & little enough to deliberate upon the preliminaries of ſo unuſual a Treaty; but however, it was no Denial. Mean time, * *the Proteſtants often deſir'd the Action ſhould begin* (it ſeems, they were in great haſt) but *difficulty was ſtill rais'd, ſometimes about the manner of treating, ſometimes about the matter with which to begin...* * *the Adherents of* Ceſar, *Spaniards, & others, mov'd by the Emperour's Ambaſſadors, deſired to proceed; but the Papalins* (he has always a fling at the Court) *ſuſpecting that the end of the Imperialiſts was to come to the Reformation of the Court of* Rome, *embrac'd all occaſions of delay. The Legate*, ſays he, *was thought to feign* himſelf ſick; but *Soave*, I preſume, did not think ſo himſelf, becauſe he tells us in the very next page, that *he died* ſoon after at *Verona*, which was no good proof of his diſſimulation. But let us go on with his ſtory. * *The firſt of* April, *the Elector of* Saxony *beſieg'd* Ausburg, *which did render it ſelf the third*

* p. 352. * p. 353. * ibid.

third day, & the ſixth news came there-of to Trent, *& that all* Tirol *did arm, & meant to go to* Inſpruc ... *Therefore many of the* Italian *Biſhops embark'd, & went down the river* Adice, *to go to* Verona, *and the Proteſtan's determin'd to depart.* See here the true cauſe of their departure: and tell me no more, of their being either denied audience, or liberty of diſputing.

XIII. The place was not ſecure. A. Very true; it was far from being ſecure for the Catholicks: The Proteſtant Army forced them to ſuſpend the Council, *April*, 28. Neither was it any wonder, that they were ſo much afraid of their victorious arms: *Soave* ſays, * *The Emperour was forced to fly by night, with all his Court from* Inſpruc, & *to wander in the mountains of* Trent, and that *a few hours after,* Maurice *arrived there, the ſame night, & made himſelf Lord of the Emperour's baggage.* Conſider here, on the one ſide, how little reaſon the Proteſtants have to complain of the choice of this place: 1. it was nigher the Proteſtants of *Germany*, than the Catholicks of *Spain* & *France*: 2. the Pope's

*p 355.

forces had no acceſs thither; 'twas in the Emperour's power: 3. the appearance only, of the Proteſtant Army, was enough to fright away the Council. On the other ſide, you ſee how juſtly the Pope refus'd to call a Council in any City of *Germany*, for fear of the Proteſtant arms. As for the Canon, *Ut illic lites terminentur ubi exortæ ſunt*, 'tis underſtood of thoſe cauſes, where ſome fact is to be prov'd by witneſſes that live upon the place.

XIV. The Council was not free. It was call'd by the Pope: And nothing could be determin'd till the Pope ſent his inſtructions from *Rome*. A If any man have a right to convocate the ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical Aſſembly, 'tis certainly He who has from God the ſupreme Eccleſiaſtical power upon earth; and this right, of calling it, appertains as manifeſtly to the Pope, as the convocation of a Provincial Council belongs to the Metropolitan. Moreover, *Soave* ſays, the Princes in the Diet of *Noremberg* deſired * *that by the Pope, with conſent of the Emperour, a free Council ſhould be intimated as ſoon as was poſſible*: he ſays, the Emperour ſent

* p. 31.

ſent Letters to the Diet of *Spira*, that * *he was reſolved to paſs into* Italy, *and to* Rome, *to treat with the Pope, for the calling of a Council*: and afterwards, under *Pius* IV. he ſays, * *all Princes had agreed in demanding it.*

As to the Second part of your objection; 'Tis certain that, if it had ſtood with the Pope's conveniency, He ought to have been preſent. In his abſence, 'twas neceſſary for the Legates, repreſenting his perſon, to receive frequent directions from him, that they might the better ſupply the want of his preſence. If, for this reaſon, it was lawfull to give them inſtructions before the Council began; why not, afterwards, as long as the Council was ſitting? In fine, whatſoever advice came from *Rome*, Nothing in matter of Doctrine was determin'd, which any conſiderable part reſiſted. *Soave* himſelf confeſſes, * *that it was a general Maxim in this Council, that to eſtabliſh a Decree of Reformation, a major part of voices was ſufficient; but that a Decree of Faith could not be made if a conſiderable part did contradict.*

XV. Many of the Biſhops were

* p. 34. * p. 304. * 538.

Penſioners to the Pope. A. *Soave* acknowledges, that ſeveral * *of the Biſhops, moved by poverty, made grievous complaints*, & threatned *that they would depart.* If therefore the Pope maintain'd ſome of them, it was a great charity done by him; a good example to Princes; a thing which formerly uſed to be done by the Emperours. 2. Secular Princes had more money than the Pope; and, if it had been the policy of his Holineſs, they might eaſily have countermin'd it. 3. All the Popes, in their Bulls of Convocation, deſired & exhorted all Secular Princes to ſend as many of their Bishops as poſſibly they could. 4. His Penſioners were not neceſſary for him, at leaſt in the Proteſtant Controverſies; & therefore this is no excuſe for the Reformation.

XVI. In ſome Seſſions, under *Paul* and *Julius*, there were ſcarce any beſides *Italians*. A. 1. The Council being drawn out from 1545. till 1563. & actually ſitting for about four years, it cannot be rationally expected that any great frequency of Bishops ſhould be continually preſent. 2. The diſorders, cauſed by the *Calviniſts* in *France*, and by

* p. 116.

by the *Lutherans* in *Germany*, required their Bishops residence to secure Catholick Religion at home; otherwise they would not have been absent from the Synod. 3. The dissentions that hapned betwixt the Pope, the Emperour, & King of *France*, and the civil wars betwixt Catholicks & Protestants, hindred the Bishops, sometimes of one Nation, sometimes of another, from attending the Council. 4. All this was fully recompenc'd, in the third & last Convocation of the Council, under *Pius* IV.

XVII. In the end of the Council, we find 187. *Italian* Bishops, and all the rest make only 83. A. 1. All these *Italians* were not of the Pope's Territory, but a great many of them subject to the Emperour, the King of *Spain*, the Duke of *Florence*, & the State of *Venice*. In several matters they had different instructions, & adhered to their divers interests, even in opposition to the Pope, when the Ambassadors of their Princes craved their assistance. *Soave* tells us, * *it was publickly said* by the *Papalins* (so he is pleas'd to call them) *that* France *had ever pretended to limit the Pope's power, & subject it to the Ca-*

* p. 522.

Canons; and *that this opinion would be follow'd by many* Italians, *who, becauſe* they *cannot, or know not how to make uſe of the preferments of the Court, do envy thoſe that do; beſides thoſe, who are deſirous of novity, they know not why, of whom there ſeem'd to be a conſiderable number.*

2. 'Tis no great matter, as to our preſent purpoſe, whether the Pope had all the *Italian* ſuffrages at his beck, or no; becauſe 'tis certain he had no need at all, of any ſuch aſſiſtance, in deciding the Proteſtant controverſies, in which the Bishops, of all nations, unanimouſly agreed. See what *Soave* ſays, concerning the following points. Apoſtolical Traditions. p. 145. *It was approv'd by all, that they ſhould be receiv'd, as of equal authority with the Scriptures.* Vulgar Edition of Scripture. p. 150. *It was approved almoſt by a general conſent.* & p. 152 *the Congregation being ended, the Cardinal* Santa Croce *aſſembled thoſe that had oppoſed the Vulgar Edition, & ſhew'd they had no reaſon to complain, becauſe it was not prohibited, but left free to correct it, & to have recourſe to the Original; but that only it was forbid to ſay, there were*

were in it Errors of Faith for which it ought to be corrected. Original Sin. p. 164. *No man reſiſted the condemnation of the Articles.* Juſtification & Merit. p. 215. *In condemning the* Lutheran *opinions all did agree with exquiſite Unity.* Sacraments. p. 219. *All the Divines agreed in affirming the number ſeven, & condemning the contrary opinion as heretical.* Baptiſm & Confirmation. p. 232. *All parties* were *ſatisfied.* Worship of *Chriſt* in the Euchariſt. p. 306. *All agreed.* Communion under one kind. p. 306. *All made uſe of long diſcourſes, but all to the ſame purpoſe.* & p. 485. *They all agreed that there was no neceſſity, or precept, of the Cup.* Tranſubſtantiation. p. 309. *There was a contention between the two Schools,* Dominican *and* Franciſcan, *which troubled the Fathers, with the ſubtility & ſmall fruit thereof.* The *Dominicans* ſaid, *the one ſubſtance is made of the other;* The *Franciſcans* ſaid; *the one doth ſucceed the other;* Both agreed, that *it is properly & truly called Tranſubſtantiation:* & p. 310 *it was determin'd in the General Congregation, to uſe an expreſſion ſo univerſal as might be accommodated to the meaning of both parties,* without approving

ving or condemning, either the one, or the other. Sacrifice of Maſs. p. 508. *In the diſcuſſions of the Divines, all were uniform in condemning the Proteſtant opinions*; although there was *ſome contention*, whether or no *Chriſt* at ſupper *offered himſelf*; p. 538. *ſome ſaying, that, in regard of the three & twenty contradictors, it was not lawfully decided*; and *others anſwering, that an eighth part could not be called conſiderable*. Auricular Confeſſion. p. 328. 329. 330. No diſagreement appears among the Prelates or Divines, concerning the 6. 7. & 8. *can.* of the 14. *Seſſion*. Extreme Unction. p. 330. *The Divines ſpoke with* ſome *prolixity, but without any difference among themſelves*. Promotion of married perſons to holy Orders. p. 698. *The Fathers did uniformly, & without difficulty, agree upon the negative*. Matrimony. p. 730. *The doctrine, & anathematiſms, were read; to which all conſented*. Purgatory. Invocation of Saints p. 749 *The Decrees were read, & all approved, with great brevity & little contradiction*. Indulgences. p. 757. *The Decrees were read, & approved by all*.

XVIII.

XVIII. Proxies were not allowed to have deciſive votes. A. 1. There were but ſeven in the Council. 2. They had votes in conſultations, among the reſt. 3. They had no right to a deciſive vote. 4. Were it indifferently allowed, it would encourage Bishops to pretend neceſſity of their abſence.

XIX. All the Bishops were ſworn to the Pope, before they ſate in Council. A. 1. They never ſwore to vote againſt their judgment: They only ſwore Canonical obedience & fidelity to him, that is, ſuch obedience & fidelity as the Canons of former Councils require, * *as long as he is Pope, and ſo long as he commands thoſe things, which, according to God, & according to the Canons, he can command; but they do not ſwear, that they will not in Council ſay what they think; or that they will not depoſe him, if they convict him of being a Heretick.* 2. An Oath taken in general terms, to defend his Canonical rights, leaves the Council in perfect liberty to examine, what is Canonical, & what not. 3. Without the Oath they are ſtrictly bound, by the Canons, to the ſame obedience & fidelity, ſo that it

* *Bellarmin. De Concil.* lib. 1, cap. 21.

it induces no new obligation, but only confirms what was their duty before. 4. Parliament-men ſwearing fidelity to their King, according to the Laws, do not looſe the freedom of their Vote, nor the power of changing many Laws, & making others, with the King's conſent. 5. Every Bishop in the English Church, at his conſecration, ſwears due obedience to his Archbishop & his Succeſſors: Why may not Catholick Bishops ſwear as much obedience to the Pope? And what harm is there, if they take the very ſame Oath again, before they ſit in Council?

XX. In one of the Congregations the Bishop of *Guadice* was interrupted & affronted; and the Cardinal of *Lorain* complain'd, the Council was not free. A. This hapned only once, & ſatisfaction was preſently given. *Soave* relates it thus. * *The Bishop of* Guadice *ſpeaking of the laſt* * *Canon, where it was determin'd, that Bishops call'd by the Pope are true & lawfull*, ſaid that *there were alſo Bishops, not call'd by the Pope, nor confirm'd by him, which nevertheleſs were true & lawfull. For example he brought four Suffragans, elected*

* p. 593. * Seſſ. 23.

elected & ordain'd by the Archbishop of Salzburg, *who take no confirmation from the Pope. Cardinal* Simoneta *did not suffer him to proceed, saying, that whatsoever the Archbishop of* Salzburg *or other Primates did, was all by the Pope's authority. The Bishop of* Cava, *and* two more, *call'd him Schismatick,* and *said he ought to be put out of the Council.* Immediatly *there follow'd a great noise among the Prelates, as well of whispering as of feet, partly in offence of the Prelate that gave his voice, & partly in defence. The Legates did hardly appease the stir, by making others proceed, who were to speak in that Congregation; which being ended,* Lorain *said the Bishop had not spoken ill.... & indeed it was found that the Bishop had not spoken ill, and the Canon was corrected; for whereas it said, the Bishops call'd by the Pope of* Rome, *it was altered thus; the Bishops assumed by the authority of the Pope of* Rome.... Mantua *did also reprehend the noise made with feet & words, saying that, if hereafter they did not speak with respect, They,* the Legates, *would go out of the Congregation....* Lorain *commended the admonition, & said that as*

the

the Legates ought not to go out of the Congregation, for any occaſion whatſoever, ſo it was moſt juſt that the perturbers of it, ſhould be punish'd. Here you have a full account of the whole matter. It was only a ſuddain heat, & ſoon over. The publick reprehenſion, of thoſe who made a noiſe, was ſatisfaction abundantly ſufficient for what was paſt: And the altering of the Canon, according to the Bishop's advice, was a very extraordinary encouragement for him, & every body elſe, to ſpeak freely for the future. The Cardinal complain'd, before the ſatisfaction was given, & the Canon alter'd, but not after. Beſides, it is not impoſſible for great men to find fault when there is but little reaſon for it. They are uſed to be humour'd, & when they are croſs'd, a ſmall matter is enough for great complaints. I'l give you an inſtance out of *Soave*. * Lorain *and* Madruccio *had compoſed a form* concerning *Reſidence*; The Legates *approv'd it* at *firſt ſight*; afterwards, *conſulting with the Canoniſts, they diſliked one part.* Lorain *and* Madruccio *were much offended with this mutation, & thought they were diſparag'd.*

* p. 615.

diſparag'd. Lorain *ſaid, it was not a free Council.* Why was not the Council free? If the *form* which they two had *compoſed*, had been blindly receiv'd without examen; if, out of compliment to them, it had been approv'd *nemine contradicente*; All had been well; The *Council* had been *free* enough: But becauſe ſome others took the liberty to conſider it, & ſpoke their minds freely in contradicting it; therefore *the Council was not free.* Madruccio * *did not forbear to ſay, there was a ſecret Council, within the Council, which did arrogate more authority.* The *Canoniſts*, who examin'd the *form* which they two *had compoſed*, are here call'd a *ſecret Council*, & accuſed of *arrogancy*; not becauſe they aſſumed *more authority*, but becauſe they pretended to an equal liberty of ſpeaking as freely againſt the *form* as others had ſpoken for it. So proud & ſo ambitious we are, to have our own opinions idoliz'd, and to enlarge the empire of our fancies by enforcing them upon our neighbours; that when we meet with any oppoſition, though ever ſo reaſonable, we are ſtreightned for want of room, & complain

* ibid.

plain for want of liberty. So, when *Guzdellun* came to the Council, & had * *ſeen the paſſages of one day*, he *ſaid, he underſtood plainly the Council was not free.* What theſe paſſages were, *Soave* does not tell us: and, I am ſure, if any thing had hapned contrary to the liberty of the Council, the Relation of it would have been nuts to him. Since therefore your Hiſtorian leaves us to conjecture what we pleaſe; for ought I know, *Guzdellun* might have ſo great an opinion of himſelf, as to imagine, that, when he came to Council, the weight of his reaſons would have preſently turn'd the ſcale of their deliberations, & that in *one day* he ſhould carry all before him: but afterwards, when he *plainly* found his miſtake, and ſaw he could not in *one day* have all things determin'd as he pleas'd, then it was *he underſtood plainly, the Council was not free.*

XXI. In the Hiſtory of the Council we find ſeveral grievous complaints of the *Spaniſh* Prelates, that they had not their liberty in propoſing & determining the *divine right* of *Reſidence.* A. Let us hear their ſeveral complaints in order

* p. 617.

order, & if you believe your own Hiſtorian, you will find they had no reaſon to complain.

1. * They *complain'd of the Pope for holding the Council in ſervitude, to which he ought to leave free power to handle & determine all things, and not to meddle himſelf.* A. This laſt clauſe is manifeſtly unreaſonable; Why should not he *meddle* as well as they? Pray, read *Soave*, & ſee in what manner he *meddled* with them. * *He commended them for ſpeaking according to their Conſcience.... He complain'd of thoſe who referr'd themſelves unto him, becauſe the Council was aſſembled that every one may deliver his opinion...* * *He was pleas'd that every one should deliver his opinion freely... but ſaid, it was a ſtrange thing, that he who was Head of the Church, and other Prelates, who have voice in Council, may not be inform'd of what is handled, and ſpeak their opinion... whereas, on the other ſide, it is plain that ſo many Prelates come to* Trent *with commiſſion from their Princes, according to which they proceed; & that the Ambaſſadors by Letters & perſwaſions do compell them to*

* p. 474. * p. 470. * p. 471.

to follow the intereſts of their Maſters, & yet, for all this, no man ſays, that therefore *the Council is not free. This He amplified with much vehemency*, & certainly with a great deal of reaſon.

2. In their Letter to the King of *Spain*, They * *complain'd of the Legates* for not ſuffering *the point* of Reſidence *to be concluded, before they could have* an *anſwer from* Rome. A. They themſelves aquainted the King with theſe matters: Why might not the Legates inform the Pope? They * *beſeech'd his Majeſty to conſult with godly men about this Article*: Why might not the Pope *conſult with godly men*, as well as He? They * *aſſur'd themſelves that, after mature deliberation, He would favour their opinion*: Whether *He would* or not, was more than they could tell, till they had an anſwer; & Why might not an *anſwer* be expected from *Rome*, as well as from *Madrid*?

3. In the ſame Letter, they complain'd * *that there was no liberty in the Council*, becauſe *the* Italians *did overcome with plurality of voices*. A. In the ſame Letter they tell the King, *that two thirds of the Prelates did deſire the*

* p. 515, * ibid. * ibid. * ibid.

the Definition, & *that all the Ambaſſadors did favour the Truth herein.* If *two thirds* were *for* them, & only *one* third *againſt* them, can you tell me how twas poſſible for them to be *overcome with plurality of voices*?

4. They complain'd that * *when a propoſition is made in which* 70. *Biſhops do uniformly agree, they are hindred even to ſpeak thereof.* A. Who hindred them? *Soave* tells us, that the King of *Spain* wrote to his Ambaſſador to let * *his Prelates* know, *He thought the Declaration did not beſit the preſent time, & therefore wisht them to deſiſt*; & that the French Ambaſſadors wrote to their Maſter, how little hopes they had of * *reforming the Court* of *Rome*, becauſe *the* Spaniards, *who were very zealous for the Reformation*, were *cooled, & put in fear, by the reprehenſion of their King.* But the Pope, inſtead of *wishing them to deſiſt*, * *commended them for ſpeaking according to their Conſcience.* Neither did the Legates *wish them to deſiſt*: They only * *anſwer'd, that the Article was not fit to be propos'd in that Seſſion, but that it ſhould be done in time convenient*: which was ſo far from being

* p.475. * p.505, * p 507. * p.470, * p.473.

being any *hindrance* of their *ſpeaking*, that upon the very next occaſion * *they began to diſcourſe again of it . . . & the heat grew ſo great, that ſome of the Ultramontans threatned to proteſt & depart* ; and perhaps would have departed, had not the Ambaſſadors pacified them. So unreaſonably jealous men are of their Liberty, that, even when they take too much, they think they have too little.

XXII. *Andrew Dudith*, Bishop of *Five-churches*, ſent by the Emperour *Ferdinand* as his Ambaſſador to the Council, writes afterwards a Letter to *Maximilian* II. in which he complains that *the votes were not weighed but numbred*, that *the Pope had a hundred for one*, that *the Holy Ghoſt was ſent from* Rome *in a Poſtillons Cloak bag... O monſtrous extraordinary madneſs! Nothing could be ratified which the Biſhops did decree, unleſs the Pope made himſelf the Author of it.* A. 1. His Lordship was perhaps a little angry when he wrote this Letter; & an angry man, you know, is apt to talk extravagantly: *Iratus nil niſi monſtra loquitur.* What would you ſay, if a *Member of*

* p. 477.

of the *Houſe*, a friend of yours, should complain at the ſame rate; O *monſtrous extraordinary madneſs! nothing could be ratified in Parliament which the Lords & Commons did decree, unleſs his Majeſty were pleas'd to give his Royal Aſſent.* Would you take this for the language of his Reaſon or his Paſſion? 2. Although he ſeem'd a *Catholick* when he ſate in Council, yet he declared himſelf a *Proteſtant* ſoon after; which is another motive to ſuſpect he makes the worſt of things. 3. 'Tis remarkable that his conceit of the *Cloak-bag* was firſt made uſe of in *Trent*, when the Legates, finding * *a fourth part only* againſt the *divine right* of *Reſidence*, & obſerving how * *they came to words of ſome bitterneſs*, they *exhorted the Fathers to modeſty*, *gave them leave to depart*, & *agreed to give the Pope an account of all.* This did not pleaſe the *Spaniards*: but, why Biſhop *Dudith* ſhould find fault, I cannot underſtand. *Soave* tells us, he employ'd his Rhetorick to oppoſe the Biſhop of *Aiace*, & to prove that it was lawfull for Biſhops to * *buſie themſelves in the Courts of Princes, & in the Affairs of the world.*

* p. 464. * p. 465. * p. 457.

as *being Judges, Chancellors, Secretaries, Counſellors, Treaſurers*, &c. which was, as *Soave* obſerves, a plain * *contradicting of thoſe who thought that Reſidence was* de jure divino. Pray, help me now, if you can, to reconcile your Friend's Hiſtory with the Biſhop's Letter.

1. In his *Letter*, we find him very bitter againſt the *hireling Biſhops*, the *images of* Dædalus *that mov'd by nerves which were none of their own*, the *country bag-pipes which could not ſpeak, but as breath was put into them*. And who would think, after all this, that in your *Hiſtory* we ſhould find him among theſe very *Papalins*, & as buſie as the beſt of them, giving his ſuffrage with them, againſt the Decree of Reſidence? Who *hired* him? what *nerves mov'd* him to ſide with them? Whoſe *breath* was *put into him* to make him *ſpeak* in favour of them? 2. In his *Letter*, he complains *the votes were not weigh'd but numbred*: And, in your *Hiſtory*, the agreement of the Legates, not to determine a point of Doctrine, which † *a fourth part did diſlike*, makes it plainly appear,

* p 458. † p. 464.

pear, that the *votes* of Bishop *Dudith's* party *were not* only *numbred* but *weigh'd*. 3. If we believe his *Letter*, *the Pope had an hundred for one*, & *if thoſe had not been enough, he could have* ſent *a thouſand more* in a Cloak-bag *to have helpt in time of need*: And, if *Soave's Hiſtory* may be believ'd, the *Papalins* in this occaſion were * *a fourth part only*; They had *three* for *one* againſt them. How to accord theſe matters, I confeſs, I am at a loſs: when you have nothing elſe to do, you may try you skill at leaſure. Mean time, I can diſcover no other reaſon, he had to quarrel with the Council, but that it was a Body with a Head. He had a mortal averſion againſt the Pope: And, whether the *Papalins* were for *Dudith* or againſt him, 'twas all the ſame: If his Holineſs were conſulted, he had not patience to ſupport it without exclaiming, O *monſtrous extraordinary madneſs!* What ſhall you & I call *Paſſion*, if this muſt paſs for *Reaſon*?

XXIII. *Soave* himſelf, after having related the manner how the Council was transferr'd from *Trent* to *Bolonia*,

* *ibid.*

defies any man * *to ſay what liberty they had.* A. Let us hear him tell his own ſtory; take it in pieces; & ſee whether *Soave* be not able to anſwer himſelf.

The Article of *Reſidence* being ſet on foot by the *Spaniards*, together with ſeveral other points of Reformation; the Legates wrote to *Paul* III. that * *the Prelates did every day take more liberty, not refraining to ſpeak of the Cardinals without reſpect, and with ſmall reverence of his Holineſs: that hereafter it would be hard to keep them in order, becauſe they had many private aſſemblies among themſelves... & that it was not likely they would be ſo bold, without they were upheld, & perhaps incited, by ſome great Prince.* The Pope *conſiderd, that all the Reformation aim'd to reſtrain* his *Authority, & to enlarge the power of Biſhops*...that * *the* Spaniards, *are a wiſe Nation who ſtep not one foot forward without looking a great way before them... He thought that this webb was ſecretly ſpun by the Emperour, in regard his Ambaſſador did dayly treat with them... He weigh'd above*

* p. 251. * p. 239. * p. 241.

above all, his words uſed to the Nuncio, that he had no greater enemy than the Pope. He fear'd that when he had eſtablisht an abſolute authority in Germany, *he would think to do alike in* Italy, *making uſe of the Council to ſuppreſs the Papacy ... To tranſlate it to a place where he had* more *abſolute authority, ſeem'd the beſt Counſel ...* Bolonia *ſeem'd the beſt place ... & he reſolv'd to cauſe it to done by the Legates, by the Authority given them in the Bull of Tranſlation. Being thus reſolv'd, he ſent a private Gentleman, with Letters of credit, to do this Ambaſſage to both the Legates ... * The* 21. *of* April, *the Popes meſſenger appear'd & declar'd to the Legates his Credence ...* At this time, *it hapned fitly, that many in the families of the Prelates were ſick ... the air had been moiſt many days before ... the Phyſicians ſpoke as if the diſeaſe were contagious ... it was reported that the neighbour places would have no commerce with the City.. The Phyſicians were examin'd,* & a *Proceſs* made *concerning the Peſtilent infirmity ... the Proceſs was proſecuted until the* 8. *day, when news came that* Vero-

* p. 248.

na *would trafick no more with them*... *Therefore, the* 9. *day, a general Congregation was held*, & *Monte* took this opportunity to *propose the Translation of the Council, & cause the Pope's Bull to be read*... *The Emperour's Prelates answerd that the disease & dangers were not so great*, and look'd upon it as * *a pretence. The next day a Congregation was call'd to consult upon the same matter. It was found that* 11. *Prelates were already parted; & they began to speak of the place, whither to go. That it should be in* Germany *all did abhor. It could not be in the State of any Prince, because they had treated with none. The Legates propos'd* Bolonia... *The Imperialists did contradict: but the major part consented*... *The next day, the Session being held, & the Decree read,* 25. *Bishops &* 3. *Generals did assent, but the Cardinal* Pacceco *&* 17. *other Bishops opposed. Among those that consented, there was not one of the Emperour's subjects*, &c. In this Relation I have purposely omitted several clauses, not only for brevity sake, but because I cannot think that any man is oblig'd to believe such abusive constructions & conjectures,

* p. 250.

conjectures, without better proof than *Soave's* bare word for't. And now you may here obſerve,

1. How little power the Pope had in *Trent*, ſince he thought it not fit to appear in this buſineſs, & ſince the Legates were in great danger of finding an inſuperable oppoſition, had not the ſickneſs *happned fitly* for the purpoſe.

2. How much power the Emperour had over all his Prelates. *Soave* ſays, * *the Imperialiſts were commanded by the Emperour's Ambaſſador, not to depart, until his Majeſty were inform'd, & gave them order.* He gives an account afterwards of their * *remaining in* Trent *by expreſs order from the Emperour*, and obſtinately * *refuſing to go* or ſend *to* Bolonia, *to acknowledg the Council*; although the Pope * *pray'd them*, either *to come, or ſend Proctors.*

3. The Pope *praying* on the one ſide, the Emperour *commanding* on the other; the *prayers* being ſlighted, the *commands* being punctually obey'd; 'tis eaſy to conclude, which was moſt likely to reſtrain the liberty of the Council, when return'd to *Trent*: eſpecially, if we conſider the Emperour's being then * *King*

* p. 250. * p. 253. * p. 260. * p. 262. * p. 283.

of Spain *and* Naples, *Prince of the* Low-Countries, *& having other adherencies in* Italy.

4. The Emperour's Proteſtation, read by *Valaſco* in the Council of *Bolonia*, ſhews plainly what liberty might be expected from him, who aſſumed to himſelf the arbitrary priviledg of judging the * *opinions of the Fathers*, & determining *who did ſpeak for conſcience ſake*, & * *who, though not ſo many in number, ought to be preferr'd, as more wiſe.* At this rate, All the other Prelates of the Univerſal Church, what would they ſignifie? Though they were ten for one againſt them, 'tis no matter; the Prelates of the Emperour muſt always be ſuppos'd to be the men *who ſpeak for conſcience ſake*, the men *who are more wiſe*, & *therefore* the men *who ought to be preferr'd.*

5. If the Pope, having juſt reaſon to ſuſpect the future ſervitude of the Council, endeavour'd to prevent the great diſorders, which might happen in *Trent*, by giving ſecret inſtructions to his Legates, to transfer the Synod to *Bolonia*, Who can blame him?

Soave ſays, * *it ſcandaliz'd every one.*

* p. 263. *. p. 264. * p. 251.

one. And yet I know not why they ſhould be ſcandaliz'd, any more than you & I were, when King *Charles* remov'd the Parliament from *Weſtminſter* to *Oxford.* He goes on, *if the two Legates could command all the Prelates to part from Trent, & compel them by cenſures, Let any man ſay that can, what liberty they had.* 'Tis eaſily *ſaid*; They had, all of them, liberty to vote freely according to their conſcience; The Legates commanded no body; The matter was put to Votes, & the Majority carried it: And now, *Let any man ſay, that can, what liberty they* wanted.

XXIV. This is not all. The ſame Author (having rehears'd how the Fathers at *Bolonia* unanimouſly agreed, not to *treat* of *returning* to *Trent*, till *thoſe, who remain'd there, firſt* came to *Bolonia, to unite with the reſt, and acknowledg the Council*;) concludes with theſe words, * *The Spirit which was wont to move the Legates to think as the Pope did, & the Bishops to believe as the Legates, did work as formerly it had done.* A. Have but patience to conſider well what *Soave* himſelf has ſaid elſewhere;

* *ibid.* * p. 260.

and, if you believe him, you'l believe he is miſtaken here.

1. Pray, what ſpirit *formerly* mov'd all the *Imperialiſts* to ſtay behind at *Trent*, when the reſt went with the Legates to *Bolonia*? In *Trent* the Bishops *formerly* had *diſagreed* about *going* thence: Afterwards in *Bolonia* they all *agreed* about *ſtaying* there. And, truly, if *Soave* could have perſwaded us that Concord & Diſcord are all one, he might eaſily have made us believe that in *Bolonia*, *The ſpirit workt as formerly it had done*. Beſides, Theſe of *Bolonia* were the major part, & tis no wonder they perſever'd in their reſolutions: Thoſe of *Trent* were the leſſer part, which ought to have ſubmitted, and yet, although the Pope exhorted them to their duty, & * *prayd them*, either *to come*, or *to ſend Proctors*, they ſtill remain'd as obſtinate as the others were conſtant. And, I muſt needs ſay, betwixt you & me, if your Friend *Soave* had been impartial, he would never have committed ſuch a miſtake in the misplacing of his jeſt: He would have told us (with a great deal of Truth, & without appearance of impiety) that *The ſpirit which was*

* p. 262.

was wont to move the Ambaſſadors *to think as the* Emperour *did, & the Biſhops to believe as the* Ambaſſadors, *did work as formerly it had done.*

2. If, by this conceit, he would inſinuate that the Legates were always *Papalins*; I muſt beg your pardon, if I undertake to prove it notoriouſly falſe, by his own Hiſtory. He often tells us, how the proceedings of the Legates were contrary to the inſtructions they receiv'd from *Rome*. * *The Court did generally complain of all the Legates, for ſuffering the Article* of Reſidence *to be propoſed... becauſe they had an example of the diſorder, which this diſpute cauſed in the firſt Council.*

3. Although I do not find that, in this Council, the Ambaſſadors of any Secular Prince ever diſſented among themſelves, in things relating to their Maſter's intereſts; yet *Soave* himſelf aſſures us, that, in this caſe of Reſidence, only two of the Legates were for the *Papalins*, & three againſt them: * Altemps *follow'd* Simoneta, *and the other two adhered to* Mantua. By which you may clearly ſee that your Hiſtorian was grievouſly miſtaken,

* p. 470. * p. 464.

when he said, *the Spirit was wont to move the Legates to think as the Pope did*; for, by his own computation, there were three to two among them, who were *moved* to *think* quite contrary.

4. You remember the contest which arose, concerning the third Convocation of the Council: The *Spanish* Ambassador * *made earnest suit in the King's name, that it might be declared a Continuation of the Council, begun under* Paul III. *& prosecuted under* Julius. *He was assisted by the* Spanish *Prelates, and others who follow'd them*... On the other side, *the Emperour's Ambassadors used strong persuasions to the contrary, saying they would presently depart & protest.* The Legates were divided: Seripando *had no other aim, but that it should be determin'd to be a Continuation*... *but* Mantua *did constantly resist*... Here you may take notice once more, that *Soave's* jests are not always true ones: *The Spirit did* not *move* Mantua *to think as the Pope did*: for when the * *news came to* Rome, *the Pope was sorry to see that Cardinal joynd with the* Spaniards *in the*

* p. 473. * p 474.

the poins of Reſidence, *and oppoſite to them in the* Continuation; *which was to croſs him in all things.*

5. Afterwards * *the Pope reſolv'd that the* Continuation *ſhould be declar'd, let the Emperour do what he could; and diſpatch'd a Currier to* Trent *with this Commiſſion.* If *the Spirit had been wont to move the Legates to think as the Pope did*, why dos *Soave* tell us that, this Commiſſion *being arrived the ſecond of* June, they *all reſolv'd uniformly to inform the Pope better*, & *ſhew him the impoſſibility to perform his Order?* Why dos he tell us, that *the next day... at night, a Currier came with Letters, that his Holineſs did refer all to the wiſdom & judgment of the Legates?* I might cite you a great deal more, to this purpoſe; but this is enough to ſhew, 1. that the Legates ſpoke freely their minds, and acted according to their Conſcience; 2. that the Pope did not endeavour to hold the Council in ſervitude.

XXV. Nothing could be debated but what the Legates propoſed; the Pope's Commiſſions running with this clauſe, *proponentibus Legatis.* A. 1. At leaſt the Council voted freely upon the matters

* p. 478.

which

which were propoſed. 2. In great Aſſemblies ſuch a method is neceſſary, to avoid confuſion. 3. It was at length * declar'd, that the clauſe was not inſerted with *deſign of changing the uſual method of treating matters in General Councils*; and then, *Soave* ſays, * *The difficulty receiv'd an end, with ſatisfaction of all.*

You that have read *Soave*, may eaſily remember a great many paſſages, in which the Prelates over-ruled the Legates, & forced them to debate things which they had no mind to. 1. This clauſe, *proponentibus Legatis*, was * *much agitated*: 2. The Title of the Council, *Repreſenting the Univerſal Church*: 3. The *divine right* of *Reſidence*: 4. The *Inſtitution* of *Bishops* being *de jure divino*: 5. The general Reformation of the Church: which point might have been pusht perhaps too far, if the Legates had not wiſely counterpoiſed it, with propoſing a ſutable Reformation of Secular Princes. 6. Concerning the grant of the Cup, demanded by the Emperour, you read in *Soave*, that * *the Legates were deſirous to give him ſatisfaction, but could not, because*

* *Seſſ* 24. *cap.* 21. *de Reform.*
* P. 728. * ibid. * P. 530.

because the party of the negative prevail'd. 7. About admitting the Protestant Divines to disputation, you find that * *this opinion was readily embrac'd, first by the* Dutch, *then by the* Spanish *Prelates, & at last somewhat coldly by the* Italians, *the Legate remaining immoveable, and shewing plainly that he stood quiet, being forc'd by necessity.*

Give me leave to add one instance more, and if you are not fully satisfied with it, I shall know what to think of you. Read *Soave*, p. 498. & 499. and observe, 1. how boldly the Bishops of *Veglia* and *Sidonia* spoke their minds concerning the corruptions of *Rome*, & Reformation of the Pope himself; 2. how moderately *the Legates & other Papalins* discoursed about it, when, *the Congregation being ended, they remain'd in the place together* to consider the *boldness*, & *too much licence*, of the Prelates, in *broaching new matters.*

Upon this occasion *Castello*, who had been Speaker under *Julius*, told them that Cardinal *Crescentius* was used *to interrupt them* & *sometimes impose them silence.* But the Cardinal of *Varmia* sharply reprehended this practise, & said,

* p. 343.

ſaid, that Nothing is more neceſſary to a Chriſtian Synod than Liberty; and that, reading the Councils of the better times, one ſhall find contentions & diſcords in the beginnings of them, even in the preſence of the Emperours, which notwithſtanding did, in the end, turn, by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, into a marvellous concord; and that was the miracle which did pacifie the world. He ſaid, there were infinite contentions in the Nicene *Council, & moſt exorbitant in the* Epheſine, *and therefore no wonder if there were now ſome diverſity of opinions civilly carried, which he that would reſiſt by human & violent means, will let the world know that the Council is not free, & take from it all reputation; that it is good to refer the cauſe unto God, who will govern Councils, & moderate thoſe who are aſſembled in his name. The Cardinal of* Mantua *approv'd this opinion, & diſliked the proceeding of* Creſcentius, *but ſaid, it was not contrary to the liberty of the Council to moderate abuſes with Decrees, preſcribing the order & time of ſpeaking, & diſtributing to every one his own part.* This *was commended by Varmia, & they agreed to give order for it.*

XXVI.

XXVI. Notwithſtanding all this, the Legates would not give leave to propoſe the Article concerning the Inſtitution of Bishops. * *Granata, Braganza, Meſſina,* & *Segovia*, having *obtain'd audience of the Legates, deſired, that they might handle the Articles, that Bishops are inſtituted by Chriſt, & are Superior to Prieſts* jure divino. *The Legates, after they had conferr'd together, anſwerd, that it was fit to declare, a Bishop is ſuperior, but* * *that it was not neceſſary to ſay,* quo jure. *Granata* replyd, *that there was a Controverſy, and that, if the Divines did diſpute it, the neceſſity of deciding this point would be known. The Legates would not conſent by any means.* A. 1. They did not abſolutely forbid the debating of this matter. 2. After experience of the contentions about Reſidence, they could not but foreſee that this diſpute, ſo much connected with the other, might occaſion greater diſorders, of which they would have been guilty, had they given leave: & therefore they * *would not conſent by any means.* 3. The Divines & Prelates freely took leave, though it was not given them; & never ſpoke more boldly, than they did upon

* p. 550. * p. 551. * ibid.

upon this ſubject. If you will not believe me, believe your friend *Soave*: Read what follows, & believe your own eyes.

Michael Orencuſpe, a Divine of the Biſhop of *Pampelona*, argued, * *that howſoever it be true and certain, that Biſhops are ſuperior* jure Pontificio, *yet the Lutherans are not in this regard to be condemn'd for Hereticks, becauſe that cannot be an Article of Faith, which is grounded only upon the Law of man.*

* John Fonſeca *a Divine of the Archbiſhop of* Granata *follow'd, ſaying, it neither was, nor could be forbidden to ſpeak of it. For the Article being propos'd to be diſcuſs'd, whether it be heretical or no, it is neceſſary to underſtand whether it be againſt Faith; againſt which it cannot be, if it do not repugn to the Law of God.* He ſaid *that if the Pope be inſtituted by* Chriſt, *becauſe he hath ſaid to* Peter, Feed my Lambs, *Biſhops are likewiſe inſtituted* by him, *becauſe he hath ſaid alike to all the Apoſtles*, as my Father hath ſent me, ſo I ſend you. *And, if the Pope be Succeſſor of* S. Peter, *the Biſhops are Succeſſors of the* Apoſtles; *which* he prov'd by *many Authorities out of the Fathers. He added, that to be confirm'd*

or

* p. 558. * *ibid.*

or created by the Pope, did not conclude, that they were not inſtituted by Chriſt, *or had not authority from him. For the Pope himſelf is created by the Cardinals, and yet hath his authority from* Chriſt: *So the Biſhops receive the Dioceſs from the Pope, & authority from* Chriſt. *Their Superiority over Prieſts he prov'd to be* jure divino, *by authority of many Fathers, who ſay that Biſhops ſucceed the Apoſtles, & Prieſts the ſeventy two Diſciples.*

Antony Groſſetus *inſiſted upon* the ſame point. * *He ſaid it was neceſſary to declare, that Biſhops have not commiſſion, for their Office, from men; for ſo they would be Hirelings, to whom the Lambs do not belong, becauſe the man, who had committed the care unto them, being ſatisfied, they had no more to think on....* In the end, he excuſed himſelf, *that he had ſpoken without premeditation...* not remembring that *that point was forbidden to be ſpoke of.* Here it is that *Soave* would make us believe, that *Groſſetus* fear'd *ſome bad encounter*; but, I am ſure, if any *bad encounter* had ever hapned to him, upon this account, *Soave* would have taken care to let us know it. Have but a little patience to obſerve how freely & boldly the Biſhops deli-

* p. 559.

ver'd

ver'd their opinions in the following Congregations, and then I'l give you leave to tell me*, if you can, what *bad encounter* they fear'd.

The Archbishop of *Granata* said, * *They must needs declare both these two points, that is, that Bishops are instituted* jure divino, *and are* jure divino *superior to Priests: And he confirm'd his opinion at large, with many reasons, arguments, & authorities... He cited Pope* Eleutherius, *who, in an epistle to the Bishops of* France, *wrote, that* Christ *had committed the Church Universal to them.* He added, *that* Ambrose *upon the Epistle to the* Corinthians *saith, that the Bishop holdeth the place of* Christ, *& is Vicar of the Lord...* that *there are extant Epistles of* Cyprian *to* Fabianus, Cornelius, Lucius, *and* Stephanus, *Popes, where he giveth them the title of Brothers; and of* Austin, *written in his own name, & of the Bishops of* Africa, *in which the Popes* Innocentius *and* Bonifacius *are likewise call'd Brothers*; &, *which is most plain, not only in the Epistles of those two Saints, but of many others, the Pope is call'd* Colleague ... that *it is against the nature of a Colledge to consist of persons of divers kinds... In this*

* p. 565.

Colledg

Colledg of Bishops, the Pope is Head; but, for edification only ... that S. Gregory *saith in his epistle to* Johannes Syracusanus, *that when a Bishop is in a fault, he is subject to the Apostolick See, but otherwise all are equal by reason of humility, which Christian Humility is never separated from the Truth. He inveigh'd against those Theologues who said, that S. Peter had ordain'd the other Apostles Bishops ...* * *He jested at those Divines who had said, that all the Apostles were instituted by* Christ, *and made equal in authority, but that it was personal in them, & ought not to pass to their Successors, except that of* S. Peter; *asking them, as if they had been present, with what ground, authority, or reason, they were induced to make such a bold affirmation, invented within these fifty years only, expresly contrary to the Scripture, in which* Christ *said to all the Apostles,* I will be with you untill the end of the world, *which words, because they cannot be expounded of their particular persons only, must be necessarily understood of the succession of all.*

* *The Archbishop of* Braga *prov'd at large, the Institution of Bishops* de jure divino. *He said, that the Pope cannot take*

* p. 566. * p. 567.

from

from Bishops the Authority given them in their consecration, which doth contain in it the power, not only of Order but of Jurisdiction . . . that to Titular Bishops a City is allotted, which would not be necessary, if the Episcopal Order could subsist without Jurisdiction. He was follow'd by the Bishops of *Segovia*, of *Segna*, & others, who spoke as boldy as himself, not fearing any *bad encounter*; and *Soave* says * *almost the half were of that opinion.*

Afterwards, * *to quench the boyling heat of the controversy about the Institution of Bishops, that it might not increase, by means of so many who were prepar'd to contradict* Laynez, *they would not hold any Congregation for many days.* And yet they were so far from fearing any *bad encounter*, that *almost every day* * *three or four of them joyn'd together, & went to some of the Legates to renew the instance. And, one day, the Bishop of* Guadice, *with four others,* told them, among other things, that * *as a Prince dos institute, in a City, a Judge of the first instance, & a Judge of Appeal, who though he be superior, yet cannot take authority from the other, nor*

* p. 569. * p. 577. * p. 578. * *ibid.*

nor uſurp the cauſes belonging to him: ſo Chriſt *in the Church hath inſtituted all Bishops, & the Pope ſuperior, in whom the Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction was; yet ſo, that others had theirs depending on Chriſt alone.*

After all this, the Bishop of *Segovia*, when the Prelates met again in Congregation, argued * *that it was decided in the Congregations under* Julius III. *that Bishops are inſtituted* jure divino; *though* it was *not publisht in Seſſion, by reaſon of the ſuddain diſſolution of the Council... The Cardinal of* Mantua *cauſed the Acts of that time to be ſearch'd, & that to be read by the Secretary, which was then defined to be published... Three Heads of Doctrine were then compoſed*, and in *the third*, which was of *Hierarchy*, it was ſaid, *The Holy Synod doth teach, that thoſe are not to be hearkned unto, who ſay that Bishops are not inſtituted* jure divino, *it appearing manifeſtly by the words of the Ghoſpel, that* Chriſt *our Lord hath himſelf call'd the Apoſtles, & promoted them to the degree of Apoſtleſhip, into whoſe place the Bishops are ſubrogated; neither ought we to think that this ſo eminent & neceſſary a Degree, hath been brought into the Church*

* p. 582.

by

by human inſtitution. There were *alſo eight Canons*, the *laſt whereof ſaid* thus: *He that ſhall ſay, that Biſhops are not inſtituted* Jure divino, *or are not Superior to Prieſts, or have not power to ordain, or that this doth belong to Prieſts, Let him be Anathema.* This *the Cardinal of* Mantua *interpreted, only of the power of Order,* & the Biſhop of *Segovia* underſtood it *of All, which containeth Order & Juriſdiction*; and, though *he anſwer'd reverently in appearance, there paſt ſo many replies, that they were forced to break up the Congregation.*

When the Cardinal of *Lorain* came to *Trent*, he told the Cardinal of *Mantua*, he * *would not be curious in unprofitable queſtions*; that, *for his own part, he was more inclined to the opinion which doth affirm* the Inſtitution of Biſhops, & the Obligation of Reſidence, *to be* de jure divino; *but, though it were certainly true, he ſaw no neceſſity, or opportunity, to proceed to a declaration thereof.* Nevertheleſs, when *Lorain* came to Council, * *The Biſhop of* Liria, *to inform* him *of all the reaſons of the* Spaniards, *did recapitulate, with great eloquence, whatſoever they had ſaid in this matter.*

*p 583. * p. 598.

matter: And added beſides, that nothing was more in favour of the Lutherans, than to ſay that Biſhops are inſtituted by the Law of man.

When *Lorain* gave his ſuffrage, he propoſed the reaſons on both ſides; he * *concluded in the end, that the Queſtion was boundleſs*; and *exhorted the Fathers to leave it, omitting* jure divino, *& ſaying* inſtituted by *Chriſt*. But notwithſtanding this, * *The* French *Prelates, who ſpoke after* Lorain, *did not uſe the ſame ambiguity, but maintain'd openly, that the Authority of Biſhops was* de jure divino.

Again, in another Congregation, * *The* French *made proof of their liberty. They ſaid, that the Inſtitution & Juriſdiction of Biſhops was* de jure divino, *as well as that of the Pope; that there was no difference, but in degree of Superiority; and that the Pope's Authority is confined within the limits of the Canons, relating & commending the ſtile of the Parliaments of* France, *that when any Pope's Bull is preſented, which containeth any thing contrary to the Canons receiv'd in* France, *they pronounce it to be abuſive, & forbid the exe-*

* p. 596. * *ibid.* * p. 598.

cution. Have you never heard, that ſuch boldneſs as this, even in a free Parliament, has been enough to ſend a man to the Tower? And yet, *Sowe* confeſſes, *They were heard with much patience.* Conſider well theſe paſſages, from the beginning to the end of this Diſpute; and tell me then, what liberty was wanting in the Council.

XXVII. If the Prelates were ſo bold, & took ſuch liberty, How was it poſſible for the Council to end ſo quietly? A. In ſome matters, they had full * *ſatisfaction*; as in the clauſe, *Proponentibus Legatis.* In ſome, a *conſiderable part* oppoſed, as in the *Doctrine* of *Reſidence*; which therefore, according to the * *general Maxim* of the Council, could not be determin'd. In others, as the *Inſtitution* of Bishops, & the Pope's *Authority*, although their arguments had been urged, repeated, & amplified, in ſeveral Congregations, yet ſtill the major part was of another opinion; it was, therefore, impoſſible to come to any determination: And, you know, how natural it is, for reaſonable men, to be quiet and ſilent, when they plainly ſee, it is in vain to ſpeak.

XXVIII.

* p. 728. * p. 538.

XXVIII. Was not the Pope's Authority, at length, made uſe of, to reſtrain their liberty, under pretence of their abuſing it? A. *Soave* himſelf, who never makes the beſt of things, is pleas'd to tell us quite another ſtory. *Lorain* (who, at his firſt coming to *Trent*, had oppos'd the * *declaration* of theſe points, & had * *exhorted the Fathers to leave it*) * *propoſed the omiſſion of the two Articles, of the Inſtitution of Biſhops, and Authority of the Pope, as things wherein the parties were too paſſionate.* And *very fitly*, ſays your Author, * *an Order came from the Emperour to his Ambaſſadors, to uſe all means that the Authority of the Pope ſhould not be diſcuſs'd in Council; which his Majeſty did, becauſe he ſaw the major part inclined to enlarge it ... The Ambaſſadors, having treated with the Legates in conformity hereof, as alſo with* Lorain, *& other principal Prelates, did cauſe this Article to be omitted, as alſo that other of the Inſtitution of Biſhops. But firſt they made many conſultations about it, that all might reſt contented.*

XXIX. Why were the Popes, of thoſe times, ſo afraid of a General Coun-

* p. 583. * p. 596. * p. 684. * ibid.

cil? Why ſo averſe from it? Why did they, to ſecure themſelves, ſhift ſides ſo often betwixt the Emperour & King of *France*? A. You might as well have ask'd me, Why dos a Pilot fear a ſtorm? Why is he ſo averſe from it? Why dos he trimm the boat ſo often? S. *Peter's Ship*, in thoſe days, was grievouſly toſs'd, & almoſt *coverd with the waves*: But our Lord, who ſeem'd to *ſleep*, at length *aroſe*, commanded *the winds & the Sea*, & there follow'd *a great Calm*.

XXX. Why did they avoid, & defer ſo long, the General Reformation? Why were Bulls given ſecretly to the Legates, to ſuſpend or transfer the Council, as occaſion ſerv'd? Why did they openly declare, that a Council is ever dangerous, when the Pope's Authority is queſtion'd? A. You'l never have done with theſe cramp-queſtions, except a man give you as good as you bring. Is not the *Reformation* of *Abuſes*, in the *Church*, as dangerous as the *Redreſſing* of *Grievances*, in the *State*? If our Nation were in the ſame ferment, as under the reign of *Charles* I. would you blame his Majeſty for pretending to prorogue or diſſolve as he pleaſes? And have we not, ever ſince, great reaſon to believe

believe that a Parliament (though, otherwiſe, excellent in it ſelf) is always dangerous, when the King's Authority is queſtion'd? In thoſe tumults of Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, *Reformation* was a dangerous buſineſs: And, had the Reformers been *let ſlip* at the *Abuſes*, they would perhaps have *worry'd* the whole *Church*. If S. *Paul* was *in perils among falſe Brethren*, the Succeſſor of S. *Peter* was no leſs. * *Not only the Proteſtants did impugn* his *Authority, but many Princes alſo would reſtrain it, & many Biſhops did think to moderate it.* * *The Spaniards had a ſecret, which they communicated only among themſelves, to make great the Epiſcopal Authority, ſo that the Pope could not reſtrain it.* The *French* had * *ever pretended to limit the Pope's power, & ſubject it to the Canons & Councils.* * *The Emperour's Ambaſſadors had given the Proteſtants hope to moderate the Papal Authority, & ſaid that they expected to ſee a Gate laid open by their negotiation, that afterwards they might ſecond it:* and *Julius* III. *had intelligence, that the Emperour had a deſign to advance himſelf, by debaſing of the Papacy.* This was enough

* p. 284. * p. 205. * p. 522. * p. 349.

to make the Popes, of that Age, take care to look before they leap'd. But yet this was not all, if *Soave* says true. The * *Governours of Countries regarded not much, what the Council might determine concerning Doctrines; but desired it might be such a one, as might reduce the Priests & Friers to their beginning; hoping that by that means the regalities & temporal jurisdictions might return unto them. And therefore they said, it was in vain to call a Council where the Bishops, & other Prelates, only, should have a deliberative voice; because they ought to be reform'd, and it was necessary that others should have the charge thereof, who could not be deceiv'd by their proper interests.* Here you see, in plain English, what the *Reformation* was like to come to. 1. The design was laid to bring the Ecclesiasticks *to their beginning*: They were to be brought to their *Staff* and *Scrip* again, & sent about their business, whilst the Reformers plunder'd the Church, & divided the spoiles. 2. To do it with more ease, *it was in vain to call a Council of Bishops*, but the Laity were to *have the charge thereof, who could not be deceiv'd by their proper interests.* This Reason, I confess, if

* p. 17.

it

it had taken place, would have been worth it's weight in gold: but, pray, give me leave to make the caſe your own. Suppoſe a man ſhould demand your purſe; and, upon refuſal, tell you He is the better Judge, whether or no you ought to deliver; becauſe your intereſt blinds you, but He *cannot be deceiv'd by his proper intereſt*. Would you believe this honeſt Gentleman? How did you like this method of *Reforming*, when our English Rebels threw the *Sovereignty* out of doors, & the *Church of England* out of the windows? Did you fancy that thoſe *Church-and-State-Menders* deſerv'd *to have the charge of* thoſe matters, and that *it was neceſſary* they *ſhould have* it, becauſe they *could not be deceiv'd by their proper intereſts*?

If ſuch a Throughout-Reformation as this, had been effectually procured, All had been well: Complaints would then have ceas'd, becauſe there would have been nothing left to complain of: The Reformers would have *reduced* the Pope, the Cardinals, the Biſhops Prieſts & Friers, *to their beginning*, which in plain English is little better than *reducing* them *to their end*: The Faction would then have triumph'd, according to their hearts de-

fire; just as our Rebels did, when they had brought our Monarchy to it's *beginning*, by beheading of the Government. But, this not being effected, All the rest was nothing to the purpose. One would think that eleven or twelve Decrees, containing above 140. chapters of Reformation, might be some degree of satisfaction to any reasonable men: But, when people are disappointed in their principal design, right or wrong 'tis all the same, they are out of humour; and, when they are so, tis a hard matter to please them. This was the reason why the *Lutheran* Criticks were so sharp in censuring & ridiculing the Decrees, as soon as each Session of the Council was publish'd in *Germany*. p. 504. *The Birth of the Mountains*, was a proverb much in vogue, which *Soave* has recorded in more places than one, though otherwise worded, *The travail of the mountains, and the nativity of the mouse*: an expression proper enough to let us understand, what vast projects they had laid of *reducing* all things *to their beginning*; & how much they were disappointed in them; since what was decreed by the Council, compar'd with what they would have done themselves, was no more

more than a *mouſe* to a *mountain*. In the ſame page, he goes on; *Concerning the Reformation it was ſaid, that more light points could not be handled, nor more lightly; and that they did imitate the Phyſician, who, in a hectical body, laboured to kill the Itch.* This was another pleaſant jeſt, which *Soave* took care of, for fear it ſhould be loſt. But, let him jeſt as he pleaſes, the *Itch*, he talks of, is not ſo eaſily cured. This humour, of Reforming, is a very *itching* humour: And the *Itch* is a ſtrange reſtleſs diſeaſe: Even the wiſer ſort of mankind, when they have once got it, cannot for their lives forbear *Scratching*, though they know by experience that it dos more harm than good.

Read the Decrees of Reformation from the beginning to the end, and if you read them with a ſerious attention, I am very confident, an impartial man, as you are, will not ſay they are, either *light*, or *lightly handled*. If you have the *Council* in your Library, I had rather you would read them there, than in *Soave*; who, I muſt needs tell you, is not ſo exact as I could wish him. Under pretence of relating the *ſubſtance*, he leaves out a great many circumſtan-

ces, which a curious man would be desirous to know: And besides, although I have compar'd a very small part of his translation with the original, I find several mistakes in it. p. 503. n. 1. he reads *is*, for *is not*. p. 692. n. 12. he reads *six*, for *five*. p. 733. n. 2. he reads *two*, for *three*. p 753. n. 1. of two expreſs *commands*, he has made only one *exhortation*. Such negligences as theſe are enough to make me ſuſpect him in other matters; & are a great argument that it was more his buſineſs, to find fault with the Reformation, than to give an exact account of it. But, whether you conſult the *Council* or his *Hiſtory*, that you may find out all the Decrees in order, without any trouble, I have directed you to all the *Seſſions* of the one, & *pages* of the other. V. 173. 174 VI. 211. 212. VII. 247. 248. XIII. 320. 321. XIV 331. 332. 333. 334. XXI. 503. XXII. 537. 538. XXIII. 691. 692. 693. XXIV. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. XXV. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. And, for your better ſatisfaction, I have ſet down ſome few inſtances of *Soave's* Tranſlation, comparing it with the Original, & encloſing, what he has either alter'd or omitted, in a parentheſis like [this.]

1. Con-

1. Concerning Scripture. The first point of Reformation, in the first chapter, of the first Decree, is this, * *that in the Churches, where there is a ſtipend allotted for reading Divinity, the Biſhop ſhould provide that the Holy Scripture ſhould be read by the Stipendary, if he be fit; and, not being fit, the Biſhop ſhould depute a Subſtitute to perform the charge: But, for hereafter, that the Benefice ſhould not be conferred but upon a ſufficient perſon. That in the Cathedral Churches of populous Cities, & Collegiate Churches of great Caſtles, where no ſuch ſtipend is aſſign'd, the firſt Prebend that falleth void, ſhould be applied to that uſe, or a ſimple Benefice, or a contribution of all Beneficed men, to inſtitute the Lecture.* And again, concerning * *the inſtitution of Seminaries, it was conſtituted, that every Epiſcopal Church ſhould have a certain number of boys, brought up in a Colledge, to learn,* among other things, *the Holy Scripture.* All this * *The Holy Synod ordereth & decreeth [leaſt that heavenly Treaſure of Sacred Books, which the Holy Ghoſt has ſo liberally beſtow'd upon mankind, ſhould lye neglected.]*

* p. 173. n. 1. * p. 693. n. 18. * Seſſ. 5. c. 1.

2. Concerning Eccleſiaſticks. * *The Decrees of Reformation did contain, That whoſoever have right in the Promotion, ſhall be admoniſhed that it is a mortal ſin, if they ſhall not uſe all diligence to promote the moſt worthy & moſt profitable to the Church. And it was added, How neceſſary it is, that the Pope, in regard of his Duty, ſhould endeavour to aſſume Cardinals of* [*moſt*] *excellent worth, & to provide the Church of fit Paſtors, becauſe if the flock ſhould perish by* [*the evil government of perſons negligent & forgetfull of their duty*] Chriſt *will demand an account of his Holineſs.* * *That* [*Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitans, &*] *Biſhops, ſhall be bound to viſit* [*their proper*] *Dioceſs... That the Viſitor ſhall go with a modeſt train of men & horſes, diſpatching the Viſitation, as ſoon as may be; and ſhall not receive any* [*money, or preſent, whatſoever it be, or in what manner ſoever it be offered*] *but frugal & moderate Diet...* * *That the Biſhops ſhall be bound to preach in perſon; or, having a lawfull impediment, by others. And in caſe the Parish-Prieſt be hindred, that he cannot preach in his own Church, he ſhall, at his charge, maintain another to*

* p.732.n.1, * p.733.n.3, * *ibid.*n.4.

*to do it, deputed by the Bishops... That the Bishop shall admonish every one [that, where it may conveniently be done, he ought] to go to his own Parish, to hear the Sermon: and that None [either Secular, or Regular, even in the Churches of their own Order,] shall preach against the Bishop's will. * That where Visitation, or Correction of manners, is in question, no exemption or appeal, though to the Apostolick See, shall [any way] hinder or suspend the execution of that which is decreed or adjudged. * That no Ecclesiastical person, though a Cardinal, shall have more than one Benefice, which not being able to maintain him, another simple Benefice may be added, so that they do not both require Residence; which shall be understood of all Benefices, of what title or quality soever, though Commended. And he that hath now more Benefices than one, shall be bound to leave all but one, within six months; or, if not, they shall be all void. * The Reading of the General Reformation did follow, which, after an Exhortation to Bishops, for exemplary life, [commandeth, not only that they be content with] modesty & frugality of*

* p.734.n.10. * p.735.n.17. * p.753.n.13.

of [houshold-ſtuff & table; but alſo, that in the reſt of their way of living, & in their whole houſe, nothing may appear but what bears the character of ſimplicity, zeal, & contempt of Vanities: And abſolutely] doth forbid them to enrich their friends or kindred, with the revenues of the Church; but, if poor, to allot them their diſtribution, as to the reſt of the poor. What has been ſaid of Biſhops, it Decreeth to be obſerved by all beneficed Eccleaſticks, either Secular or Regular, and alſo by the Cardinals.

Here I have cited only eight points, a very inconſiderable part, of the whole *Reformation* which contains above a hundred & forty chapters: But, for a man of your skill, a *pattern* is enough to judge of the *whole piece*. And, beſides all theſe Decrees, there are alſo others of *Doctrine*, forbidding & condemning ſeveral abuſes, which are worth your taking notice of.

1. Concerning Purgatory. * *The Synod teaches* no more, than *that there is a Purgatory, & that the Souls detain'd in it, are aſſiſted by the ſuffrages of the faithfull, & the Sacrifice of the Maſs. Therefore it doth command Biſhops to teach ſound doctrine in this matter [ſuch as is*

* p. 752.

deliver'd

deliver'd by the Holy Fathers, & Sacred Councils] *and cauſe it to be preached, without handling ſubtil queſtions before the ignorant people, nor ſuffering uncertain & unlikely things to be publiſhed; Prohibiting curioſities, ſuperſtition, & unhoneſt gain.*

2. Concerning Maſſes. * *A Decree was read concerning abuſes, to be corrected, in the celebration of Maſſes: And contain'd in ſubſtance; that the Biſhops ought to forbid all things brought in by Avarice, Irreverence, or Superſtition.*

3. * *In matter of Saints, it doth command Biſhops, & all others who have the charge of teaching, to inſtruct the people concerning the interceſſion & invocation of them, according to the ancient doctrine of the Church, conſent of Fathers, & decrees of Councils, teaching, that the Saints do pray for men, that it is profitable to invocate them, & to have recourſe to their prayers & aſſiſtance, to obtain benefits from God, through* Jeſus Chriſt *his Son our Lord, who is our onely Saviour & Redeemer. Concerning Images*; that *thoſe of* Chriſt *& the Saints, ought to have due honour given them*; but *that there is no divinity or virtue in them*

* p. 537, * p. 751.

them ... Afterwards it addeth, that, desiring to take away the abuses, & occasions of pernicious errors, it doth Ordain .. that all Superstition, in invocation of Saints, in worship of Reliques, & in use of Images, be taken away.

4. Concerning Indulgences. * *The Synod doth* only *anathematize those that shall say, they are unprofitable, & that the Church hath not power to grant them. It doth command that all those offices of Pardon-mongers be abolished: And, for the other abuses* [*which have taken their rise from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or any other way, Whereas they cannot conveniently be forbidden, in particular, by reason of the manifold corruptions of provinces, & places where they are committed,*] *it doth command the Bishops, that every one shall collect all* those *of his own Church, to propose them in the Provincial Synod,* * *which shall be call'd by the Metropolitan, or the most ancient Suffragan, within one year, at the most, after the end of this Synod, and afterwards, every* [*three*] *years, at least.*

Tell me now your opinion concerning these matters. All these *points*, are they *light*, and *lightly handled*? Are they all nothing

* p. 737. * p. 733. n. 2.

nothing to the purpoſe? Suppoſe the *Vineyard* had been a little neglected, & the *Vines* wanted *pruning*, Will nothing elſe ſerve your turn, but *reducing* them *to their beginning*, & cutting them up by the Roots?

I had almoſt quite forgot to tell you that, in the end of the *General Reformation*, the Council has taken particular care, that no Diſpenſing power may obſtruct the force & benefit of the Decrees. *Be it known to all men*, ſays the Council, * *that the Canons ſhall be obſerved* [*exactly &*] *indiſtinctly by all, & ſhall not be diſpenſed, but for* [*an urgent and juſt*] *cauſe, heard with* [*great*] *maturity, & without coſt* [*by whoſoere they are, to whom it appertains: Otherwiſe, the Diſpenſation ſhall be judg'd Surreptitious.*] If the *Cauſe* be, not only *juſt* but *urgent*; if the *juſtice* and *urgency* be well *known* before the grant of it; if nothing be given to any *whoſoever* for it; Such a Diſpenſation is unqueſtionably blameleſs. And now, I deſire to know, How was it poſſible for the Council to provide more effectually for the punctual obſervance of all theſe three conditions, than by declaring that *otherwiſe* the *Diſpenſation* is, & ſhall be, *ſurreptitious*, & of no effect?

XXXI. In the end of the Council, there

* p. 756. n. 18.

was

was great joy in Rome, for having cheated the world, and advanced their interest, where they fear'd to have their wings clipp'd. A. Here I know not how you'l be able to make the two ends of *Soave*'s History meet. In his first book, he talks much at this rate; and, in his last, he largely contradicts it. He tells us, in the end, how the Pope and Cardinals deliberated upon the matter, whether or no the Decrees of Reformation, were to be confirmed; And says, that * *the Court, understanding that the Pope was resolved upon the Confirmation, chang'd their joy into grief; All the Officers complain'd of the losses they should receive in their offices, if that Reformation were executed... Supplications also, & Memorials, were given to the Pope, by those, who, having bought their Offices, & foreseeing this loss, demanded restitution... The Pope having diligently consider'd thereof, deputed eight Cardinals to consult upon the Confirmation; & to think upon some remedies for the complaints of the Court...* He concludes, *It is certain, that they who did procure the Council, had no aim but to pull down the Pope's Authority; And, while the Council did last, every one did speak, as if it had power to give Laws to him.*

After all, you think to mortifie me

* p. 759.

with

with objecting, that the corruptions of the *Court*, & the abuſes tolerated in the *Church*, are as great as ever. But you muſt give me leave to tell you, 1. I am not obliged to take your bare word for't; 2. Whether it be true or falſe, 'tis nothing to my preſent purpoſe. If falſe, you are to blame for ſaying ſo: If true, 'tis none of the Council's fault. Having proceeded legally, & having made good Laws, the Council has done its part: 'tis ours, to do the reſt. My buſineſs is to defend the Council: I have nothing to do, to rake the dung-hill of the Church. Has the *Decalogue* leſs Authority, becauſe the greateſt part of mankind are ſo diſobedient? Or is the *Ghoſpel* leſs Sacred, becauſe there are ſo few who live according to the maxims of it? If this be the onely reaſon, why you Proteſt againſt the Council of *Trent*, becauſe the Decrees of Reformation are not every where, in all things, punctually obſerv'd; I ſee no reaſon, why you may not, with as good a grace, Proteſt againſt the *Ghoſpel*, & the *Ten Commandments*.

I have now done with your Objections: And although I am not of the Poet's mind, that *Brevity is always good, be it, or be it not, underſtood*; Yet I have endeavour'd to be as ſhort as poſſibly I could, becauſe, when I deal with a man of your parts, a

word

word is enough to the wise, & few words are best.

As for *Soave*, whom you so much admire, I desire to ask you a few questions, before I tell you what I think of him. Suppose a mortal enemy of yours should *Libel* you, by the way of *History*; call you *Rogue* & *Rascal* in the very Preface; and, at the same time, perswade his Reader, that he *follows exactly the truth*: Would you have me take this Author for an Oracle? Would you not think me reasonable, if I suspected almost every word he said? And ought not I to do the *Council* as much Justice, as I would my *Friend*? Tis certain that *Soave* was a mortal enemy of the Council: In the very beginning, he declares it: He says, * *it has caused the greatest deformation that ever was*, & calls it *the Iliad of the Age*; which is as kind a compliment to the Fathers, as if he had call'd them, a pack of *Villains*. He tells us indeed, in the same place, that he is *not possess'd with any passion, which may make him erre*; and this was well enough said; But how shall a body do to believe him? If it were your own case, I'm sure you would not like my being credulous: And how do I know but that an Enemy of the Council may

* p. 2.

may deſerve as little credit, as an Enemy of yours?

Another reaſon, why I do not like him, is becauſe he takes upon him to write men's private thoughts, with as much aſſurance as he writes their words and actions. He hardly ever ſpeaks of any intelligence coming to *Rome*, but he entertains his Reader with a pleaſant Scene, in which he brings the Pope alone upon the Stage, diſcourſing with himſelf his ſecret apprehenſions & deliberations upon every matter; ſuch thoughts as no wiſe man would truſt his neighbour with, although he were the beſt & ſureſt friend he had in the world. How *Soave* could poſſibly come to any certain knowledg of ſuch things, I am not able to comprehend: And truly, if a man, in one caſe, will tell me more than he *can* know; I have juſt reaſon to be afraid that, in another, he'l tell me more than he *dos* know.

A third reaſon, which weighs more with me than all the reſt, is this: You tell me, on the one ſide, He was a *Popiſh Frier*; And, on the other, I cannot believe, but that (although perhaps, for ſome reaſons, he did not openly profeſs it) He was really a *Proteſtant*. It appears ſo plainly, by his cenſuring the Decrees of *Doctrine*, as well as thoſe of *Reformation*,

tion, & by the ſevere reflections of his own, which he intermixes with thoſe of the *Lutheran* Criticks; that I do not conceive how any man of ſenſe, who reads him with attention, can be of another opinion. Had he been a barefaced Proteſtant, I ſhould be more inclined to believe him. There is ſomething of integrity & honour in a man that openly profeſſes what he is: And, although paſſion & prejudice may blind him, yet I am apt to think that ſuch a perſon will never deceive me, more than he deceives himſelf. But a *Proteſtant*, that lives & dies in the profeſſion of a *Popiſh Frier*, How can I believe his *words*, when the moſt ſerious of his *actions* are only ſo many lies? For my own part, I would as ſoon make choice of a *Catholick Jew* to comment upon the Ghoſpel, & to write the life of *Chriſt*, as I would chooſe a *Proteſtant Frier* to write the Hiſtory of a *General Council*.

Before I end my Letter, give me leave, once more, to mind you of the Diſcourſe we had, when we ſaw one another laſt. We both agreed, that * *it were a very irrational thing to make Laws for a Country, & leave it to the inhabitants to be the Interpreters & Judges of thoſe Laws; for then every man will be his own Judge,*

*, C. II. p. 1. &

& by conſequence no ſuch thing as either Right or Wrong : that * *therefore we cannot ſuppoſe, that God Almighty would leave us at thoſe Uncertainties, as to give us a Rule to go by, & leave every man to be his own Judge*: that * *Chriſt left his Spirit & Power to his Church, by which they were the Judges, even of the Scripture it ſelf, many years after the Apoſtles, which Books were Canonical, & which were not* : that * *the Judgment of the Church, is without Appeal; otherwiſe, what they decide would be no farther to be follow'd than it agrees with every man's private Judgment* : that *becauſe, in the Apoſtles Creed, we believe in the Holy Catholick Church, therefore we ought to believe in the firſt four General Councils, which were true & legal Repreſentatives of it* : And laſtly, that *if the Council of* Trent *were prov'd to be as General, as free, & as legal in all it's circumſtances, as any of the firſt four Councils were; then you muſt needs own your ſelf obliged in Conſcience to ſubmit to it, & to leave of Proteſting againſt it.*

This laſt part I have here endeavour'd to prove, out of *Soave* himſelf, your own Hiſtorian, who always makes the worſt of things, & never ſpeaks a favourable word,

* *ibid.* * *ib.* * *ibid.* p. 2.

word, but when the Power of Truth conſtrains him to it. If I have not perform'd according to expectation; 'tis your own fault, who are to blame for having a better opinion of me than I deſerve. I am no Doctor, nor Graduate; but every way unfit to be a Champion of the Cauſe. Yet, having receiv'd your Commands, I have juſt reaſon to expect, that you will eaſily pardon a man, who in this occaſion is guilty of no other crime than being ready to ſhew himſelf,

Sept. 22. 1686. Your Obedient Servant, N. N.

Page. 70. *line.* 1. *read.* rewarded. p. 75. *. 4. r. *ch.* 14. p. 76. l. 8. r. his 9. book. p. 85. l. 26. r. many. p. 86. l. 29. r. the year 831. p. 89. l. 8. dele *de*. p. 114. l. 21. r. his 2. book. p. 152. l. 27. r. shut out. p. 161. l. 6. r. it has. p. 165. l. 1. r. your. p. 168. l. 5. r. *hæreticis*. p. 172. l. 3. dele an. p. 176. l. 26. r. in this. p. 189. l. 22. r. *to* Baſil. p. 190. l. 9. r. the caſe. ibid. l. 13. r. *HÆRETICIS*. p. 194. l. 1. r. another. p. 225 l. 3. r. *Charles* II. p. 240. *. 2. r. 590.

FINIS.